DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 979 JC 960 567

AUTHOR	Katsinas, Stephen G.; And Others
TITLE	A Study of Community College Participation in the JOBS Program: A Report to America's Community Colleges.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children and Families (DHHS), Washington, DC. Office of Family Assistance.
PUB DATE	Jun 95
CONTRACT	ACF-940-153
NOTE	173p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; *College Role; *Community Colleges; Employment Services; Institutional Characteristics; *Job Skills; *Job Training; Labor Force Development; National Surveys; *School Involvement; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program

ABSTRACT

This two-part report presents quantitative and qualitative data from a 1994 national study of community college participation in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program, a transitional welfare-to-work program. Following a preface, an executive summary reviews the study methodology, indicating that 277 colleges out of 1,170 surveyed participated in the study, and describes findings and conclusions. An introduction then provides a brief history of federal welfare programs, a description of the JOBS program, and a review of difficulties experienced by states in implementing JOBS. This section also highlights the importance of effective coordination among participating agencies and the key role of community colleges in providing workforce training under JOBS. Part 1 then analyzes results from the study related to the characteristics of responding colleges, their level of involvement in JOBS policy development, barriers to the effective delivery of the JOBS program, and the level of collaboration between state agencies and the colleges. This part indicates that there was a significant increase in the participation of community colleges in providing services to JOBS participants from 1990 to 1994, that welfare-to-work transition services are well established, and that there is considerable integration with services provided by other community agencies. Finally, part 2 reviews JOBS programs at community colleges, presenting 19 case studies of exemplary practices involved in the program. A list of responding community colleges, the survey instrument, and cover letters are appended. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 399 979

A STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PARTICIPATION IN THE JOBS PROGRAM: A REPORT TO AMERICA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Stephen G. Katsinas
Department of Educational Leadership
The University of Toledo

Timm J. Bliss
Department of Agricultural Economics
Oklahoma State University

J. Matthew Short
Department of Educational Leadership
The University of Toledo

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S.G. Katsinas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

June, 1995

This study was completed with funding from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance - Contract No. ACF-940-153. The findings and conclusions of this report do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the funders.

JC 960 567

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iv

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ix
- **Findings** ix
- **Conclusions and Recommendations** xv

INTRODUCTION[1]
- A Brief History of Federal Welfare Programs 1
- Breaking the Cycle of Poverty: How the JOBS Program Works 3
- State Difficulties in Implementing JOBS 8
- Effective Coordination Among Participating Agencies 9
- A New Role for Community Colleges 11

PART I: Community College Involvement in JOBS --A Quantitative Assessment 13

- **Analysis of Results** 14
  - Demographic Information on the Responding Community Colleges 14
  - Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development 27
  - Barriers to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs 29
  - Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges 33
- **Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations** 35

[1]Readers who already possess a comprehensive knowledge of the history that led to the creation of JOBS programs and community college involvement in welfare-to-work programs may wish to skip directly to section, "Analysis of Results."

Part II: Voices from the Field--A Qualitative Representation of JOBS Programs at Community Colleges 44
Executive Summary 45
Discussion and Analysis 53
List of Institutions 55

Rural Community Colleges 56
Blue Mountain Community College (OR) 57
Chemeketa Community College (OR) 59
Cleveland State Community College (TN) 63
Colorado Mountain College (CO) 65
Haywood Community College (NC) 69
Independence Community College 72
Jefferson College (MO) 74
John Tyler Community College (VA) 77
Linn-Benton Community College (OR) 79
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College (OK) 82
Piedmont Virginia Community College (VA) 87

Suburban Community Colleges 92
College of Lake County (IL) 93
Joliet Junior College (IL) 98

Urban Community Colleges 102
Dundalk Community College (MD) 103
Florida Community College at Jacksonville (FL) 109
Los Angeles Southwest College (CA) 114
Miami-Dade Community College, North Campus (FL) 118
Mt. Hood Community College (OR) 122
Portland Community College (OR) 128

REFERENCES 132

APPENDICES
One: List of Responding Community Colleges to the Survey Instrument 136
Two: Survey Instrument and Cover Letters 143

LIST OF TABLES AND CHARTS

Chart 1: Community College Involvement in JOBS Programs A Qualitative Analysis 47

Table 1: Distribution of Survey Respondents by Geographic Area 14
Table 2: Total Student Headcount Enrollment (Including Non-Credit Courses) of Responding Community Colleges 16
Table 3: Work Force Development Programs Offered by Community Colleges That Had "Economic Development" in Their Formal Mission Statements, By Type of Population Served 18
Table 4: Educational Programs and Services Related to Work Force Training Offered at Community Colleges 20
Table 5: Community Colleges Operating JOBS, JTPA, and Other U.S. Department of Labor Programs 22
Table 6: Participants Served by JOBS Programs at Responding Community Colleges 23
Table 7: Estimated Funding for JOBS Programs at Responding Colleges, Fiscal Year 1993 24
Table 8: Involvement of Responding Community Colleges on Selected Workforce and Economic Development-Related Councils 26
Table 9: Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development 28
Table 10: Internal and External Barriers to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs 30
Table 11: Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges Regarding the JOBS Program 34

PREFACE

America's 1,200 community, junior and technical colleges emerged as the nation's largest delivery system of formal education to adults in the late 1970s. At the beginning of that decade, many leading higher education commentators--including the prestigious Carnegie Commission--had predicted that one-third of the postsecondary institutions open in 1970 would be closed by 1980. The culprit was the decline in the traditional 18-24 year old college-going group, the demographic "bust" that followed the so-called 'baby boom' of the 1960s. These predictions were particularly alarming for community colleges, because the number of public community colleges had nearly doubled between the 1959-1960 and 1969-1970 academic years, from 328 to 634.[2] Would hundreds of new community colleges be forced to close?

The dire predictions of colleges closing were proven wrong, however, as millions of Vietnam War veterans used their G.I. Bill postsecondary education benefits to enroll at community colleges.[3] In the 1980s and early 1990s, enrollments at these institutions continued to steadily expand, as more adults sought educational skills that would allow them to command better employment within a fast-changing economy. By 1993, over 50 percent of all first-time college students chose to enroll at community colleges. Community colleges came to serve much higher proportions of underrepresented groups, including women, minorities, and low-income families, than did residential universities[4], or highly selective liberal arts colleges, that continued to enroll students from the traditional 18-24 year-old "market."

---

[2] The number of publicly controlled community colleges in the United States rose from 328 in the 1959-1960 academic year to 634 in 1969-1970. With the influx of Vietnam War veterans, the number rose to 846 in 1979-1980, according to the U.S. Department of Education.

[3] Katsinas, S.G. *Community colleges and workforce development in the new economy*, in Community Services Catalyst, Winter, 1993.

[4] American Association of Community Colleges. Community colleges: A national profile. Washington, DC: 1993.

But how far does the "open door" extend? Many community colleges now serve large numbers of non-traditional students who failed in the secondary systems "the first time around." Support for developmental education programs at institutions of higher education, even open-door, open-access community colleges in recent years have been under attack, at the state and federal levels. Given the fact that many, if not most welfare recipients possess writing, reading, and mathematic levels below that of high school before entering JOBS programs at community colleges, the issue then is one of how much financial resources is society willing to invest to insure that a meaningful "second chance" exists.

This is where community colleges and welfare-to-work programs such as JOBS come together. One serves to expose students to a wide set of career options and choices by providing a comprehensive system of student support services, the other tries to push persons victimized by poverty to see that they too can participate fully in the American dream of democratic self-government and economic entrepreneurship. For this reason, the welfare provider community needs to know more about America's community colleges, and America's community colleges need to know more about the welfare provider community.

In this regard, it is critically important to note that the development of the nation's welfare-to-work and employment and training systems preceded the development of the nation's premier system of formal education beyond the high school for adults by at least fifteen years.[5] Given the fact the vast majority of AFDC recipients participating in the JOBS program are adults beyond high school age, it follows that a study that assessed the participation level of community colleges in JOBS would be of significant value to policymakers concerned with the coordination and integration of employment, training, welfare-to-work, and literacy programs.

This report, *A Study of Community College Participation in the JOBS Program, a Report for the Welfare Provider Community* is the companion to a more comprehensive report, *A Study of Community College Participation in the JOBS*

---

[5]Katsinas, S.G., & Swender, H.J. *Community colleges and JTPA: Involvement and opportunity*. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 62(6), pp. 19-23 (June/July 1992).

Program, a Report to America's Community Colleges. Both were developed for the Office of Family Assistance under Contract No. ACF-940-153. As the welfare provider community knows quite well, these are audiences with different and distinct languages. Part I of the much longer report for the higher education community includes brief sections on the history of welfare programs in the United States, the Family Support Act, How the JOBS Program Works, and other information with which the welfare provider community is intimately familiar. For this reason, this report offers an Executive Summary of the quantitative assessment of JOBS programs at America's community colleges, and summaries of the qualitative case studies of effective collaborative practice of JOBS programs at rural, suburban, and urban community colleges.

Readers interested in reading a descriptive analysis of the survey itself, and who wish to gain greater perspective on the role of community colleges in welfare to work programs are invited to consult the companion report, *A Study of Community College Participation in JOBS Programs - A Report to America's Community Colleges.* The tables that reported the survey results are provided in Appendix One. A total of 277 community colleges responded, representing 45 of the 50 states. Tables 1-8 present community college perceptions regarding the geographic setting of the programs (rural, suburban, or urban), the size of the community college, how JOBS programs fit into the larger mix of work force programs offered at the community college, institutional commitment, related educational programs and services, the number of participants served, the funding levels of the JOBS programs, and the involvement of the local community college in work force and economic development related councils and advisory boards. Tables 9-11 present perceptions regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development, internal and external barriers to effective community college delivery of JOBS programs, and state agency and community college collaboration.

Voices from the Field: A Qualitative Representation of JOBS Programs at Community Colleges provides case studies in a summary format of exemplary practice by community colleges involved in JOBS programs. The 19 case studies presented are from 12 states, and include a variety of geographic settings (rural, suburban, and urban). Institutions asked to submit case studies had indicated in the quantitative survey that they had received an award from a public or private

local, state, or national entity. These community colleges were invited to submit information on the services offered by their institutions to JOBS participants. The full length case studies are presented in Part II of the larger companion report, *A Study of Community College Participation in the JOBS Program, a Report to America's Community Colleges*. They are presented in summary form here.

Like all studies of a qualitative nature, there are limitations regarding the representation of the population in the sample, as well as the bias of the authors in editing and analyzing data. Still, the authors believe the case studies illustrate good practice in the field. By grouping the institutions in geographic categories of rural, suburban, and urban, our goal of describing good practice, in the hope of avoiding unnecessary "wheel re-inventing," will hopefully be achieved.

The Quantitative Survey Executive Summary written by Timm J. Bliss and Stephen G. Katsinas. The tables from that survey are offered in Appendix One of this report. The authors wish to thank their colleagues at The University of Toledo UT) and Oklahoma State University (OSU) for their support and assistance, particularly Philip J. Rusche, Dean, College of Education and Allied Professions, UT, and Grover H. Baldwin, Chairperson, Department of Educational Leadership, UT; Rhonda J. Robinson, Office of Education Research, OSU; Kenneth McKinley, Associate Dean of Education Research and Interim Dean of the College of Education at OSU; and Joseph W. Licata, Area Head, Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education, OSU. Bliss and Katsinas wish to acknowledge that the survey was developed with the assistance of experts at community colleges involved in employment, training, and literacy programs from a list supplied by NETWORK, "America's Two-Year College Employment, Training and Literacy Consortium." The President of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), David Pierce, kindly signed a cover letter to gain a good response rate to the written survey, and James McKenney, Director of Economic Development at AACC, provided encouragement and assistance.

The qualitative case studies were submitted by the institutions themselves, and edited and summarized in the form presented here by Stephen G. Katsinas and J. Matthew Short. Katsinas and Short wish to thank the respondents at the community colleges, and Robert J. Visdos and Richard Anthony, who respectively

serve as President and Research Associate of the NETWORK Consortium, for their assistance in encouraging community colleges to respond. All three authors express their gratitude to the Office of Family Assistance in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which provided funding to support this research (AFDC-940153), and within that office, Yvonne Howard and Susan Greenblatt.

The views expressed in this volume are, of course, ours alone, and in no way should be interpreted to reveal or even reflect the perspectives of those who supported the research. In a work of this type, there will inevitably be some errors, and we apologize in advance for any mistakes we may have made. We are confident that our colleagues will correct our errors, as the nature of scholarly inquiry is, as Brint and Karabel noted in 1989, is necessarily "untidy."

We do, however, hope for an increased involvement on the part of other scholars regarding the role of the community in providing social mobility for participants through various welfare-to-work, employment and training, and adult literacy programs. We need a much better understanding of what constitutes good methodological practice among which groups (urban vs. rural, African-American vs. Hispanic, female vs. male, etc.), and what teaching tools (computer interactive video, videotape, recitation, etc.) are most effective. During the last fifteen years, most of the scholarly work in higher education has focused upon the work of elite research universities (for example, Allan Bloom's Closing of the American Mind). The role of community colleges in providing social mobility is too important to leave under-investigated. With this work, we add to what we hope will be an expanding debate, and more important, a better understanding of good practice.

Toledo, Ohio and Stillwater, Oklahoma — *Stephen G. Katsinas*
Stillwater, Okahoma — *Timm J. Bliss*
Toledo, Ohio and Stillwater, Oklahoma — *J. Matthew Short*
June, 1995

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rationale for the Survey

1. *First and perhaps most important, no survey has been developed since the 1990 study by the NETWORK Consortium.*

   Billed as "America's Two-Year College Employment, Training and Literacy Consortium," the NETWORK Consortium includes over 250 community colleges from throughout the United States.[6] In 1990, NETWORK surveyed community colleges throughout the United States regarding their involvement in the JOBS program. That study found 15 percent (56 out of 384 responding community colleges) provided services to JOBS participants on their campuses (NETWORK, 1990).

   Given the five year phase-in of the JOBS provisions of FSA, it is likely that the 1990 NETWORK study occurred too early in the history of the JOBS program to be an accurate barometer of community college participation. In addition to a quantitative assessment, this study provides a qualitative assessment by providing a diverse number of case studies that represent the diversity extant in the field. Through this two-pronged approach, this study represents a significant contribution to the current knowledge base.

2. *With the full phase-in of JOBS now in place, occurring, there is a need to assess the perceptions of community college professionals regarding what works, what doesn't, and other key issues related to the integration of JOBS programs and community colleges.*

3. *Few studies have addressed the policy or institutional barriers to education beyond the high school for recipients of AFDC.*

   This quantitative and qualitative survey of current practice from the perspective of those involved in serving JOBS participants within the nation's largest delivery system of formal education to adults, community colleges, is useful to the welfare provider community. Additionally, specific knowledge of how community colleges have overcome barriers to JOBS

---

[6]Until June of 1994, the NETWORK Consortium was headquartered at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, Ohio. It is now based within the offices of the American Association of Community Colleges, in Washington, D.C.

program implementation and program requirements to integrate JOBS participants into their institutions is useful to college staff.

4. *A survey of community college participation in JOBS is helpful to officials at the state and federal levels who regulate the JOBS program at the both levels.*

   These officials are interested in promoting an efficient and effective expenditure of federal and state funds for JOBS-sponsored educational programs. They would specifically be interested in expanding their knowledge of the broad range of services and programs offered at community colleges, as well as the institutional capacities of community colleges to serve this population.

5. *This survey is informative to community colleges currently involved with JOBS programs.*

   The analysis of the views of practitioners regarding issues and problems related to implementation and successful administration of JOBS programs would be of specific assistance. This survey also provides information about successful JOBS program practices by representing the diversity of community college settings where JOBS services are provided to AFDC recipients.

Methodology of the Survey

This survey investigated the level of involvement of America's community colleges in federal welfare reform by examining demographic data and the perceptions of community college professionals associated with the JOBS Program. These professionals might include presidents, vice-presidents, institutional JOBS coordinators, counselors, and literacy specialists, reflecting the diversity of organization and complexity of community colleges. The interest was to learn the views of these professionals regarding five specific topics:

(1) What is the level and extent of community college participation in the JOBS program?

(2) What identifiable model programs exist to provide postsecondary

educational services to AFDC recipients? Are there identifiable models appropriate to specific types of community college settings (rural, suburban and urban/inner city)?

(3) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development?

(4) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding communication and collaboration between state agencies that oversee JOBS programs and community colleges?

(5) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges of the barriers, both internal and external to the institution of effective community college delivery of JOBS services?

The survey instrument, "The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program: A National Study," was developed to respond to these questions. After receiving input from leading community college welfare-to-work professionals, the survey instrument was revised and readied for distribution. The survey was mailed to 1,170 community colleges represented in the member listing furnished by the American Association of Community Colleges, current as of April, 1994. A cover letter from AACC President David Pierce was obtained with the purpose of encouraging a higher rate of community college response. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix A.

Community colleges from 45 states chose to participate and returned completed instruments. Two-hundred and seventy-seven completed instruments were received from the 1,170 community colleges initially distributed, an overall response rate of 24 percent. This response was considered to be very representative of the overall universe studied, and more than appropriate for this survey. The names of the 277 community colleges that returned the completed instrument are listed in Appendix B, "The Name and Location of Each Community College That Responded to the Survey Instrument." Models are discussed in Part Two of this study, "Model Programs at Community Colleges."

Findings

1. *Since 1990, a significant expansion in the participation of America's community colleges in providing services to JOBS participants has occurred.*

   The percentage of community colleges providing services to JOBS participants increased from 15% in 1990 (NETWORK Survey) to 52% in 1994. This expanded participation is likely part of a general growth in the involvement of community colleges in employment, training, and literacy programs of all types, as these institutions become more focused on economic development as a means to provide access and social mobility (Katsinas, 1994a). Eighty-three percent of responding community colleges strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that "My community college has simply chosen not to participate in the JOBS program."

2. *The Family Support Act (FSA) envisioned welfare-to-work transitioning by connecting JOBS participants to related education services. Most community colleges already provide such services, even if not involved in JOBS.*

   This survey found that 96% of responding community colleges offered a vocational/technical curriculum, 91% Adult Basic Education/developmental/ remedial courses, 88% job-skills training/job readiness activities, 82% job development/placement services, 78% education for individuals with limited English proficiency, 75% GED preparation, and 69% supportive services including child care and transportation. Interestingly, 57% operated small business entrepreneurship/incubation centers, a significant result given the employment growth in that sector since 1970.

3. *The FSA envisioned welfare-to-work transitioning for JOBS participants through promoting integrated services with other community agencies. Community colleges are already well-integrated in their communities.*

   Four in five community colleges offered JTPA programs (79%), and were involved in their local Chambers of Commerce (82%). Two-thirds were involved in their area economic development council (66%), and their area councils on literacy (65%). Six of ten responding community colleges were involved in their Private Industry Councils (61%). [7]

---

[7]Most community colleges are *governed locally* by trustees who more widely represent the diversity in their communities than any other institutional type within the U.S. higher education

4. *Significant diversity by geography, by total enrollment size of the institution, by the number of JOBS participants at their institution, and by funding level, and geography, exists among community colleges involved in providing services to JOBS participants.*

   There is diversity among the colleges themselves, and the communities they serve. By geographic setting, 52% of the respondents were from rural community colleges, 21% from suburban, and 27% from urban. By total enrollment size of the institution, nearly half (49%) had total enrollments under 7,500 students, 21% between 7,500 and 14,999 students, and 16% with enrollments of 25,000 students and above. By number of JOBS participants, 42% served fewer than 100 persons, 43% served between 100 and 499 persons, 7% served between 500 and 1,000 persons, and 8% served over 1,000 persons. By funding level, of the community colleges that provide services to JOBS participants 56% received less than $100,000 per year, 22% between $100,000 and $250,000, 9% between $250,000 and $500,000, and 13% received over $500,000 per year. As one would expect, the larger institutions serve greater numbers of JOBS participants and have higher levels of funding.

5. *Child care and transportation were the two barriers most cited by community college professionals for the JOBS participants they served.*

   By two-to-one margins, community college professionals believed that there were insufficient funds within their states for both child care *and* transportation services for JOBS participants at their institutions.

6. *There is a need for better understanding among community college professionals of JOBS programs and services.*

   One-fourth of community college professionals (25%) believed that federal student aid was still being counted against welfare eligibility in their states, while another 35% were unsure. While 56% of respondents believed that the administrators at their community college understood the rules and

---

system, with more women and more African-American Hispanic, and Native American trustees on the boards of community colleges than on the boards of any other type of postsecondary institution (Ingram, 1991). This representativeness of the communities they serve, be they rural, suburban, or urban, may speak to their capacity and positioning to integrate the related educational services envisioned by JOBS into their communities.

regulations of JOBS, a substantial minority of 31% disagreed. Only 23% of the respondents agreed that federal JOBS regulations provided sufficient flexibility for the states and their community colleges to administer JOBS programs effectively. Fifty-five percent were either unaware or uncertain if a data collection system for JOBS existed in their state.

7. *Community college professionals strongly agree with the goal of increased coordination of services for JOBS participants. They also favor increased local control. Meetings to coordinate services, however, do not always occur.*

   Nearly all of the respondents (92%) favored program integration, to be achieved by regular meetings of representatives of their institutions and JOBS, JTPA, and literacy agency administrators. Yet only 40% responded that such meetings occurred in their localities on a regular basis; 41% did not believe such meetings occurred, and 19% were unsure. Only 23% strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that "There exists a large amount of **fragmentation** (including lack of communication and 'turf battles') between various agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) in my state." A significant minority (24%) believed that their state agencies had shown little or no interest in delivering services to JOBS participants at their community college. Finally, 52% of respondents believed the lack of common "in-take" forms for both the JOBS and JTPA programs prevented full integration of these programs at their colleges.

8. *At the state level, community college professionals believed that their governors were more involved in promoting coordination of JOBS and other literacy, employment and training programs than were their state legislators.*

   By a margin of over 2 to 1, respondents believed that their governor had taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and welfare-to-work programs. Thirty-two percent of respondents believed that their state legislators had taken an active role, compared to 26% who believed that they had not.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. *Half of all community colleges are involved in providing services to JOBS participants, and more wish to be involved.*

   Unfortunately, many community college officials do not understand fully how to integrate the services for JOBS participants into the other services their institutions provide. Community colleges already provide most of the related education services described by FSA and JOBS, and have a long history of serving large numbers of underprepared students. Further study of what works and why (discussed below) is therefore an important recommendation of this study. Such a study should specifically examine what works in diverse geographic areas (rural, suburban, and urban) of the nation.

2. *Community college professionals strongly believe in increased decentralization and local control to promote the integration of services to JOBS participants.*

   The strong bias for decentralization provides support for the conclusion that current efforts by USDHHS to grant waivers to the states enjoys strong support from community college professionals that provide services to JOBS participants. To mandate coordination through the so-called "super Human Resource Development Councils" at the state level does not necessarily translate into effective coordination of programs and services at the local level. This study therefore recommends the creation of an on-line registry to inventory state waiver requests and waiver grants, to better inform practitioners in the field and to promote greater and more effective local control.

3. *The coordination of welfare agencies and community colleges in providing services to JOBS participants is uneven.*

   The quantitative assessment revealed that in some areas coordination was quite good, and fragmentation low. However, 49% of responding community colleges believed "fragmentation" and "turf battles" still existed within their states. In others areas, fortunately, the reverse was true. The qualitative portion of this study showed that, at least at the local level, when the community colleges affirmatively decided to become involved and carry at least some responsibility for making coordination a priority, problems could be solved and long standing differences between entities smoothed over.

   Both entities--community colleges and welfare agencies alike--need to understand the capabilities, capacities, and limitations of one another. This requires greater education, starting at the state level, with the development

of inter-agency agreements and common data collection systems between community colleges systems/state higher education executive officers and the state welfare agencies. The interagency agreements send a strong signal to local entities that cooperative coordination is positively viewed.

Comprehensive data collection systems should also include vocational rehabilitation, unemployment insurance/workers compensation, and federally-funded state and local administered employment and training programs (JTPA), as well as adult literacy and vocational education programs. With the current emphasis on outcomes and assessment in higher education, many community colleges possess institutional research expertise that can help the states in developing such comprehensive systems. This study supports efforts already underway in this regard.

4. *Community college officials need to know why good coordination works in some places and doesn't in others.*

The findings of this study show that a significant minority of community college professionals believe that their own institutions are not "up to speed" on how to best promote effective coordination and delivery of services to JOBS participants through community colleges. *Promoting good coordination is not only the responsibility of the welfare provider community, but also the community college community.* This study therefore recommends that USDHHS launch an education program with the American Association of Community Colleges to disseminate information that promotes models of JOBS service delivery appropriate to rural, suburban, and urban geographic settings. This study further recommends that USDHHS examine if there are significant differences in the *kind* of education services and instructional modes delivered by community colleges that serve JOBS participants. Such a study would specifically examine if certain types of educational delivery modes are more effective with specific types of JOBS participants. Since many of the JOBS participants enter the community college deficient in the basic skills and in need of developmental education, it might be useful to involve adult literacy experts in such as study.

5. *Transportation was of special concern to community college professionals from rural areas, according to an analysis of the voices from the field in Part II.*

In rural areas of the nation with low population density and high poverty rates, transportation is an especially difficult barrier for JOBS participants to overcome, especially when combined with demands for child care. This study recommends that state and federal levels involved with Title IV

student financial aid programs, JTPA, and JOBS, as well as state student financial programs consider new ways to assist institutions that serve rural areas whose low population density and high poverty rates make transportation for JOBS participants an especially high barrier to overcome.

Again, to mandate coordination at the state level does not necessarily translate into effective program coordination at the local level, where the client/students are actually served. In low population/high poverty rural areas, such as rural Appalachia, the tribally controlled areas of the High Plains, the Lower Mississippi Delta, the Four Corners Region of the southwest, or the rural Border region of south Texas, there are few private entities with which to partner. In these areas, effective coordination of public sector programs becomes even more critical. These institutions are typically the community colleges that possess the lowest local funding base on which to draw. This study therefore recommends that DHHS, working where needed with the Labor and Education Departments, promote the dissemination of effective practice that targets JOBS services to people living in these special low population/high poverty areas.

6. *There is a strong preference among community college professionals for longer-term, as opposed to immediate short-term education and training.*

Nearly all the research data reviewed for this study supports the proposition that the higher the educational attainment level, the easier it becomes to provide training, the lower the unemployment rate and length of unemployment. Nearly all of the research data reviewed for this study supported the proposition that welfare recipients average well below high school in their educational functioning at the time that they enroll in JOBS services that are delivered by community colleges. Yet there is surprising little in the research literature regarding effective programming at community colleges for JOBS participants.

Given the fact that it is difficult to provide postsecondary education and training when the students are functioning well below high school graduate level, this study recommends the use of direct financial incentives to welfare recipients to achieve the educational goal of the high school or GED diploma. This study further recommends that DHHS in consort with state welfare agencies, the American Association of Community Colleges, the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges, and the NETWORK Consortium develop an on-line data base of effective programming similar to the AACC/NETWORK partnership with the U.S. Department of Labor (initiated in 1994) to provide an on-line listing of JTPA programs, curricula, and services.

7. *Funding is still a significant barriers to fully integrate community colleges into delivering services to JOBS participants.*

When over 50 percent of the participating community colleges agreed that there were insufficient funds for transportation and child care, funding is a problem. As noted in the literature, more than one-third of the federal JOBS funds available to states went unused in 1991 because many states did not plan to spend enough state money to obtain all of the federal matching JOBS funds. Current efforts in Ohio, South Carolina, Oregon, and Illinois to creatively match education and training funds to draw down their matching allotment of JOBS funds is a step in the right direction.

INTRODUCTION

A Brief History of Federal Welfare Programs

Between 1960 and 1992 government spending on means-tested transfers to the poor increased from 1.2 percent to 3.9 percent of Gross National Product (GNP). Over the same period, the caseload in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program increased by 460 percent (Burtless, 1992). Such enormous growth in the United States welfare system has generated much concern, not only about the monetary costs but also about the social costs involved. Public alarm over welfare has spurred government response. Since the 1960s, legislators and administrators have devised programs and policies intended to encourage welfare recipients to work and become economically self-sufficient (O'Neill, 1993).

The Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program was initially created in 1935 by the Social Security Act as a cash grant program to aid needy children without fathers (Dickinson, 1986). Conceptually, the program was designed to assist economically disadvantaged children and their mothers through subsistence cash payments. As of early 1995, the program provides cash assistance for needy children who have been deprived of parental support or care because their father or mother is absent from the home, incapacitated, deceased, or unemployed.

The AFDC program is financed through a match of federal and state funds. In fiscal year 1992, benefit payments of approximately $21.9 billion went to over 4.7 million families or 13.6 million individuals (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1993). Typically, three people are tied to the check made to each single beneficiary.

The Family Support Act (FSA) of 1988 created the Job Opportunities and Basic Skils Training (JOBS) program (O'Neill, 1993). The JOBS program constituted a

fundamental shift to welfare reform. Its chief thrust was a complex program planned to move most AFDC recipients from economic dependency to independence (Chilman, 1992). The FSA is based on the premise that there exists a mutual obligation between government and its citizens. Put differently, the government has a responsibility to provide sufficient tools and opportunities for welfare recipients to attain employment through training and education programs, while recipients have an obligation to use these tools with the longer-term goal of seeking and finding work. This emphasis on work is reflective of a societal norm that both men *and* women work, a movement away from the mid-1930s assumption that males would head households and be the sole breadwinners of families.

The FSA therefore aimed at transforming the existing AFDC system into a *transitional* welfare system. It created a presumptive right to basic education and child care, backed by greater federal funding for these activities. The Act's four specific objectives are as follows:

(1) Providing individuals with the opportunity to acquire the basic education and skills necessary to qualify for employment;

(2) Providing necessary supportive services, including transitional child care and medical assistance, so that individuals can participate in JOBS and accept employment;

(3) Promoting coordination of services at all levels of government in order to make services available for individuals at risk of long-term welfare dependency, and to maximize the use of existing resources; and

(4) Emphasizing accountability for both participants and service providers (Public Law 100-485, *The Family Support Act of 1988*).

For postsecondary educational institutions such as community colleges, the FSA represented significant change. For the first time, postsecondary education became an allowable activity by statute. Prior to 1988, postsecondary education had been prohibited. With the 1988 FSA/JOBS provisions, states were permitted

for the first time to include postsecondary education as part of the range of allowable training and education activities. However, the actual degree to which postsecondary education would be incorporated in JOBS programs was dependent upon how state regulations were written and enforced in practice, since FSA only *allowed* postsecondary education, without specifically stating a preference for it.

Breaking the Cycle of Poverty: How the JOBS Program Works

Research on welfare recipients has shown that while the average length of time an AFDC family receives assistance is approximately two years, many families remain on the welfare rolls for protracted periods of time (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989). Harvard University sociologist David Ellwood found that about twenty-five percent of those families who ever receive AFDC continue to do so for ten or more years. He estimated that this group of long-term recipients accounts for about sixty percent of those on the welfare rolls at any one time and at least sixty percent of the cost of AFDC (Ellwood, 1986). Many of these long-term recipients possessed barriers to employment such as low education and literacy levels, and a lack of work skills and experience (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989).

By establishing JOBS, the Family Support Act redirected federal welfare policy away from providing mere cash-assistance toward helping AFDC parents and teens obtain the services they needed to get and keep jobs. Although states had been required to assist AFDC recipients obtain employment since 1968, many of these welfare-to-work programs prior to JOBS had been criticized because they tended to serve small numbers of clients, and emphasized services oriented to clients who already possessed marketable skills. These people, critics argued, were likely to obtain employment without receiving such assistance (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991). The emphasis on serving the job-ready limited the ability of those programs to enhance the knowledge and skills of those with other employment barriers. Despite these problems, during the 1980s evaluations in

several states found a number of welfare-to-work programs that produced modest increases in earnings and employment for AFDC recipients (U.S. GAO, 1991).

The JOBS program targets three distinct populations that are defined as follows: (1) individuals applying for or receiving AFDC for any thirty-six of the proceeding sixty months; (2) custodial parents under twenty-four years of age who are without a high school or equivalent degree and had little or no work experience in the preceding year; and (3) members of families in which the youngest child is within two years of making the family ineligible for AFDC because of his or her age (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989). While JOBS programs targeting these specific subgroups of AFDC recipients could be effective at reducing long-term welfare dependency, informed observers have noted that it is important to realize that it will take many years before large reductions in welfare rolls will be seen (Gueron, 1990).

The problems facing the under-represented are complex. Simple solutions do not exist. Poor families, especially underclass families, face multiple barriers as they attempt to overcome their circumstances. No one single program can overcome all the obstacles this population faces. Therefore, an effective strategy will have to be multifaceted and include coordination among agencies involved with income security and other social services including housing, health, employment and job training, education, economic development, transportation, and criminal justice.

The JOBS program, through its ability to provide, mandate, and coordinate numerous services can be a starting point toward developing such a comprehensive strategy. To the extent that the long-term welfare dependents exist on the fringes of the wage-labor market, JOBS can be viewed as an attempt to reintegrate the under-represented into the mainstream economy. In this way, JOBS can broaden vocational options and attend to the supportive service needs of recipients by addressing problems that undermine employability, such as poor health, emotional problems, and substance abuse. The goal of JOBS, therefore, is to facilitate movement from the welfare rolls to self-sufficiency. The hope held out

by JOBS is that the number of under-represented individuals who make this transition can be increased through program intervention and coordination.

In addressing the problems of welfare dependency, the Family Support Act mandated certain JOBS activities, and required State IV-A agencies (Human Services, Human Resources, Welfare) the choice of implementing two of four optional program activities: (1) job search, (2) on-the-job training, (3) work supplementation, and (4) community work experience programs (Downey, 1991). State IV-A agencies are required to assure coordination of JOBS program services with other related services. These services specifically included child care and supportive services, long considered to be a major barrier to getting single parents off welfare.

In each state, the law required the governor to assure that JOBS program activities were coordinated with programs offered under the federally-funded Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), and with other available and relevant employment, training, and education programs (National Governors Association, 1993). The idea was to provide a vehicle through which to coordinate services. Under the regulations implementing JOBS, a state's JOBS program must include four services and/or activities, which may be combined rather than offered discretely:

(1) Any educational activity below the postsecondary level that the State IV-A agency determines to be appropriate to the participant's employment goal. Including, but not limited to, high school education or GED preparation, basic and remedial education, and English as a second language (ESL).

(2) Job skills training including vocational training.

(3) Job readiness activities to prepare participants to enter the world of work.

(4) Job development and job placement activity by the agency to solicit employment for participants. (*Federal Register*, April 18, 1989)

The FSA gives states broad flexibility to design various aspects of their JOBS

programs appropriate. While the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) sets program goals and provides funding, many decisions regarding the design and operation of JOBS programs are left to the states, and depending upon the situation, state legislatures as well as state and county AFDC agencies. States must offer educational programs, job skills, training, job readiness activities, and job placement and devleopment services. States may also choose to provide two or more of the following activities: Job search, on-the-job training, work supplementation, and community work experience or other work experience. In addition, states and counties must decide how to assess individuals' training needs and employability skills. States and counties must specifically develop criteria for assigning participants to activities. Finally states and counties must determine the exact content of activities, the order in which they are provided, and how long individuals may participate (Johnson, 1992).

To help states finance the program, the Act authorized two types of federal payments for states to fund their JOBS programs and related child care expenditures. The first was a new capped entitlement that is provided each year to pay a share of states' JOBS expenditures. The second was an open-ended entitlement that states may use to supplement their expenditures on JOBS-related child care. Most of the capped entitlement funds are allocated among the states according to each state's share of all adult AFDC recipients from across the nation.

To help community college professionals understand how JOBS works, it is useful to compare JOBS with a program with which they are very familiar, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs (Swender, 1991). Broad latitude is granted through JTPA law and regulations to local officials for administrative governance and program direction. The device used is the Private Industry Council; most of these councils include at least one representative from a community college (Swender, 1991). However, JOBS differs from most of the programs offered through JTPA, which require no matching state funds. For example, JTPA's Title II-A Adult Training Program, JTPA's Title II-B Summer

Youth Employment and Training Programs, JTPA's Title II-C Youth Training Program, and JTPA's Title III EDWAA Programs all require no matching funds. Only JTPA's Title II 8% Set-Aside Education and Coordination Program requires a 100% match. The matching requirements under other programs community college officials are concerned with, the Carl Perkins Program and the Adult Education Act are, respectively, only 5% of the total Perkins Title III-C allocation and only 25% of Adult Education Act programs (DHHS/Labor/Education, 1994). Thus, the JOBS program's match is very high when compared to other employment and training programs with which community colleges are familiar.

In the recent recession, many states returned portions of their federal JOBS matching allotments, with an obvious negative impact on the ability of states to deliver JOBS services to the extent and quality implied in the FSA. About 38 percent, or nearly $372 million, of the federal JOBS funds available to states were expected to go unused in fiscal year 1991 because states chose not to spend their own state funds to match all of the federal matching fund allotments. In contrast with JOBS, JTPA is nearly 100 percent federally financed. As a "flow-through," state-administered program, the ability of the local service delivery agencies and states to deliver JTPA programs is tied to federal fiscal health, not that of the states. Another key difference is that in JTPA, a Private Industry Council determines the training needed, and they approves contracts with service providers. In the case of JOBS, the funding is "attached" to the agency, and therefore the student must receive agency approval to participate in JOBS training programs. Once this approval is obtained, the student has choice in pursuing further education or training, as the individual deems most appropriate. This presents a tremendous opportunity for community colleges as institutions to, paraphrasing Steven Zwerling, "heat up" student aspirations of JOBS participants through exposure to the comprehensive curriculum of general education and technical, occupational, and vocational programs that most institutions offer.

State Difficulties in Implementing JOBS

Although states reported progress in implementing their JOBS programs, they also reported difficulties in moving toward the new directions contemplated by the Family Support Act and its requirements for JOBS. According to a 1992 study by Riccio and Friedlander, most states had already experienced or expected to have difficulties with various tasks and procedures related to the targeting and participation requirements. A U.S. General Accounting Office study in 1991 found that virtually all states had difficulties in attempting to meet new reporting requirements under JOBS. In addition, the GAO study found that almost all states reported service shortages of one type or another. More than half of the states indicated that they had, or expected to have, shortages in alternative and basic/remedial education program offerings in their state. More than forty percent of the states had, or expected to have, statewide shortages of high school equivalency and job skills training programs. An even larger percentage of states reported all of these programs to be in short supply in rural areas. More than two-thirds of the states cited child care and transportation as being in short supply (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991).

Another study found that 39 states believed that operating JOBS in rural areas was difficult due to insufficient funds for transportation (Peskin, Topogna & Marcotte, 1992). Clearly, access to transportation services, particularly in economically distressed areas of the United States such as Appalachia or the Lower Mississippi Delta is a barrier to participation. Thirty-six states reported that shortages in infant care services had made serving teen parents difficult. In addition to these aforementioned service shortages, the ability of state JOBS programs to assist participants in becoming self-sufficient has been influenced by the fiscal health of the state's budgets.

Research has also indicated that the progress of the states in moving participants out of JOBS and into employment may have been slowed by poor economic conditions. In 1990, 75 percent of the states reported that the need for employment opportunities exceeded supply throughout their states (Waddell,

1990). Thus, even if AFDC recipients receive education and training, they still may not be able to find employment that would allow them to move off the welfare rolls and become self-sufficient (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991). This likely relates to the kind of jobs available in the emerging information-based economy. In the main, these jobs require more highly skilled workers. Greater training and education opportunities will be required beyond the high school for the nation to achieve a more highly skilled workforce needed to compete in an increasingly competitive global economy (Carnevale, 1991). This speaks to the general need for federal and state welfare-to-work programs, and specific need for the JOBS program to actively promote postsecondary education degree attainment through the associate's degree, if not through the baccalaureate degree.

The significance of the implementation difficulties and the general economic and fiscal conditions of the states in which the JOBS programs operate cannot be minimized. Still, these problems can be optimistically viewed as setbacks as opposed to permanent barriers to the full implementation of JOBS. Even under the best of fiscal circumstances, the transformation of the AFDC program into a system that focuses on moving recipients into employment was never expected to happen quickly or easily. The JOBS program, and the innovation unleashed by the increased flexibility given to the states, reflected by the administrative regulatory practice of increased granting of waivers to promote state program experimentation is clearly positive. It is an indication of the dynamic nature of the American federal system, and a return to the concept of the states as "laboratories of democracy," tailoring JOBS programs to appropriately meet local conditions and local needs.

Effective Coordination Among Participating Agencies

With the passage of the Family Support Act, human service professionals and their respective agencies now face the challenge of serving and empowering families who receive AFDC and who are mandated into the nationwide, state-organized JOBS program (Caputo, 1989). Because decisions and changes at the

national, state, and local levels will affect neighborhoods, families, and individuals, it is essential that these professionals understand and coordinate the issues at all multiple system levels, as former California Senator Alan Cranston argued (Cranston, 1990).

Congress *intended* coordination among training and welfare programs, and educational agencies and institutions for a variety of reasons. Perhaps chief among these was the perception that recipients need all the help possible to simplify their entry into a welfare-to-work system. Greater efficiency is achieved when duplication is eliminated and coordination is enhanced (Dumas, 1992). *Basically, a more comprehensive approach is essential to serving the client in the 1990s.* This clearly was reflected in the legislation pertaining to JOBS, and in the practice of the Office of Family Assistance to grant waivers to the states for increased experimentation in the coordinated delivery of their JOBS programs.

Coordination is not only a useful tool for achieving a specific goal, but also a means by which all agencies can enhance and improve their individual performance (Magruder, 1988). Coordination means agencies collaborative working with other agencies to help those in need. By working together rather than in isolation, public agencies can create partnerships that benefit all agencies involved by providing improved comprehensive services to clients that better promote self-sufficiency for JOBS participants. Developing coordinated partnerships among various agencies often can require enormous effort and commitment. There are obstacles to overcome, and removing each obstacle is a separate challenge.

The most critical strategy for the creation and maintaining of coordination among agencies, according to Lawrence Bailis, is creating and maintaining a consensus that coordination is in the self-interest of each of the participating agencies (1991). This clearly includes community colleges. Interestingly, many of the nation's 1,200 community colleges have tailored their programs organizationally toward serving larger numbers of lower-income women. Easy access to facilities in the neighborhood and availability of day care in these

colleges are important attractions. Community colleges are major providers of a range of services, including but not limited to developmental or remedial courses, counseling, student aid advisement, job placement, and job development progrmas. From years of experience with these services, community colleges have become nationally recognized in their efforts to promote the success of underprepared students. Yet some research has indicated that government involved in the various adult education and employment and training progrmas possess a limited knowledge of these institutions and their capacity to effectively serve these populations. For their part, many colleges have not been particularly successful in developing relationships with training and welfare agencies to conduct funded programs (Lively, 1992).

A New Role for Community Colleges

With more than 1,200 delivery sites, and an open admissions, open-door philosophy, community colleges are the most accessible educational system for the emerging adult workforce of the 21st century. Taken together, their credit and non-credit enrollments surpassed 11 million students in 1993. There is a community college located within commuting distance of over 90 percent of the total population of the nation, and in nearly every congressional district (American Association of Community Colleges, 1993b).

Community colleges enroll approximately 43 percent of the nation's undergraduates and 51 percent of all first-time freshman students. They serve the most diverse student population of any institutional type within the U.S. higher education system. Community colleges enroll 45 percent of all minority students in U.S. higher education. Women comprise about 58 percent of all community college students. The average age of community college students is nearly 30 years of age (American Association of Community Colleges, 1993b). Community colleges serve large numbers of adult learners, as opposed to the traditional-aged students who flock to more selective colleges and universities.

The review of public policy literature conducted for this study indicates that public policymakers recognize an expanded role for community colleges in work force training. A recent report focusing on rebuilding the economic base of the southern United States, *Greater Expectations: The South's Workforce is the South's Future*, released in 1991 by the nonprofit MDC, Inc., of Chapel Hill, North Carolina, stands as a strong statement for the growing importance of community colleges. The report stated that community colleges represent the best hope for retooling the current workforce to meet the future demands of the workforce. The report suggested that community colleges can translate employers' changing needs into effective training for workers, whether that means learning basic reading and computational skill development, or implementing training on new process control systems (Smith, 1991). Clearly, the kind of continuous training system envisioned by many leading experts is more likely be delivered by accessible community colleges, as opposed to selective traditional liberal arts colleges and research universities.

Community colleges are particularly well situated to effectively prepare special populations to become more productive members of the future workforce. By the year 2000, fully 87 percent of net new entrants to the workforce will be non-traditional workers, defined as Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, returning women, and immigrants, who bring with them an entire panoply of special needs (Johnston and Packer, 1987). The magnitude of unmet training need is enormous. Taken together, then, community colleges represent a delivery system *already in place* that can serve the nation (Katsinas and Lacey, 1989), if properly deployed.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN JOBS PROGRAMS:

A Quantitative Assessment of JOBS Programs at America's Community Colleges

Part I

Community College Involvement in JOBS Programs

P A R T I

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Demographic Information on the Responding Community Colleges

Table 1, "The Distribution of Respondents to the Survey by Geographic Area," presents demographic data that characterized the geographical setting of the community colleges that responded to the survey. Of the 277 colleges that responded, 27 percent were urban-based institutions, 21 percent suburban-based, and 52 percent rural-based. This was generally reflective of the distribution among rural, suburban, and urban community colleges. There are about 650 community colleges located in rural areas as defined by the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of the U.S.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS, BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Community College Geographic Setting	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Urban	75	27%
Suburban	58	21%
Rural	144	52%

NOTE: The total number of responding community colleges was 277.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater Oklahoma.

Department of Commerce, about 300 suburban community colleges, and about 250 urban community colleges. The suburban and urban community colleges include single and multi-campus community college campuses or districts.

Table 2, "Total Headcount Student Enrollment (Including Non-Credit Courses) of Responding Community Colleges," presents the total enrollment figures (including non-credit) for the 1992-1993 academic year, as reported by each responding community college. It is important to note that the methodological emphasis on the part of the researchers on collecting data on *non-credit* course enrollments. In many states, the compensation for non-credit courses is different--typically much lower--than the compensation for credit courses. Most of the developmental and college preparatory courses that many JOBS clients likely require would only be captured by collecting enrollment data in this manner. Finally, the institutions themselves still deal with *people*--reflected in headcount data--as opposed to the statistical method by which many states allocate funds to community colleges: Full-time equivalent student enrollments, typically 12 or 15 hours.

There is great diversity among and between the institutions. The smallest enrollment reported by a responding community college was 220 students and the largest 91,146 students. Approximately one-third (32 percent) of all the community colleges that responded to the study had enrollment figures ranging from 2,500 to 7,499 students. Over 70 percent of all responding community colleges indicated they possessed total enrollments of less than 15,000 students.

These data give a sense of the diversity among and between the nation's community colleges. There indeed are wide differences among and between the states in terms of assigned functions, missions, and funding patterns. Consider the State of Illinois, for example. Illinois is one of the leading states in involving its community colleges in the JOBS program. Following an agreement between the Illinois Community College Board and the Illinois Department of Public Aid that went into effect in July, 1993, community colleges began to directly provide educational services to JOBS participants. In Illinois, there are 53 community

TABLE 2

TOTAL STUDENT HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT (INCLUDING NON-CREDIT COURSES) OF RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Total Student Enrollment (including non-credit)	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
less than 2,500	52	19%
2,500 - 7,499	90	32%
7,500 - 14,999	57	21%
15,000 - 24,999	34	12%
25,000 - 50,000	30	11%
50,000 or more	14	5%

NOTES: The total number of responding community colleges was 277. The 14 respondents that had enrollment figures over 50,000 were either multi-campus community colleges, or were community college districts that include several community colleges campuses within that district.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

college districts with local governing boards elected in non-partisan elections across the state. The campuses possess postsecondary vocational as well as traditional liberal arts transfer and developmental education courses and programs. To the north in Wisconsin, however, there are locally governed technical colleges that do not possess transfer offerings and two-year University of Wisconsin Centers administered in Madison. To the east in Indiana, the Indiana Vocational Education Department operates Ivy Technical Colleges, which offer only a limited number of transfer offerings. To the south in Kentucky, the state's 15 public community colleges are administered by a system chancellor who reports

to the President of the University of Kentucky. The institutions have limited vocational offerings. As one would expect, there is a greater emphasis upon transfer courses and programs within that system.

Each state administers and funds its system differently, and each has different state-assigned functions. This diversity among and between the states makes community colleges a very difficult set of institutions to understand.[8] Since the emergence of the modern community college system is a relatively recent phenomenon, coming well after the development of the welfare-to-work and employment and training systems, the emphasis placed upon program coordination by the JOBS program administrators could not be more timely and important.

Despite the aforementioned institutional diversity, as Dr. Ray Taylor, Executive Director of the Association of Community College Trustees has noted, *community colleges uniformly do stand for access*, particularly for groups of students historically under-served and/or unserved by more traditional institutions of American higher education. According to the annual studies of the status of minorities in higher education compiled by the American Council on Education, about 50 percent of the minorities in U.S. higher education attend this single type of postsecondary institution. These percentages are even higher when the income status of students and their families are considered.

Table 3, "Work Force Development Programs Offered by Community Colleges That Had "Economic Development" in Their Formal Mission Statements, By Type of Population Served," shows that *nearly 70 percent* of responding community colleges indicated "economic development was formally stated in their college's mission statement." Table 3 shows that 115 out of 189 community colleges, or 61 percent, indicated that they provided workforce development programs for the

---

[8] Readers interested in accessing a general overview of community college mission, functions, and funding for a specific state are urged to consult Forty-Nine State Community College Systems, by Ben Fountain and Terrance Tollefson, Second Edition (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 1992).

TABLE 3

WORK FORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OFFERED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES THAT HAD "ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT" IN THEIR FORMAL MISSION STATEMENTS, BY TYPE OF POPULATION SERVED

Of the 189 institutions that formally stated involvement in economic development in their mission statements, they served programs targeted to the following populations...	Colleges (as % of the 277)
Long-Term Unemployed (JOBS/welfare recipients)	115 (42%)
Never Employed Individuals (high school graduates/dropouts*)	138 (50%)
Temporary Dislocated Workers (JTPA/short-term unemployed)	119 (43%)
Improve Skills Of Currently Employed (value added to current workforce)	161 (58%)

NOTES:

1. Of the 277 survey respondents, 189 or 61 percent indicated that economic development was formally stated in their institutional mission statements.
2. * This category may include programs delivered to the "Long-Term Unemployed," since this population and that of "Never Employed Individuals" can overlap.
3. The "college response" represents the number of community colleges, of the 189 responding colleges, that offered these programs. It is important to note that this table in all likelihood significantly understates community college involvement in JOBS, JTPA and related workforce development programs, in that the institutions still can be involved even if "economic development" is *not* formally stated in their mission statements.
4. The methodology of population type was developed by Stephen G. Katsinas, and presented in Community Services Catalyst, Winter, 1993 issue.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater Oklahoma.

long-term unemployed (which specifically includes welfare recipients) at their institution. While it is difficult to project these data to the total universe of 1,200 community colleges, the data presented in Table 3 show an institutional commitment to involvement in activities related to economic development at the local level. Seventy-three percent of the community colleges offered programs for those never previously employed individuals, which might include both welfare recipients and high school dropouts. This indicates that these institutions, no matter how they are organized and funded at the state level, are intimately involved in providing leadership to deliver a broad range of needed postsecondary educational services to their communities.

Each community college was asked to identify from a list educational services and curricula currently offered at their institution related to workforce training. Table 4, "Educational Programs and Services Related to Work Force Training Offered at Community Colleges," identifies the educational services and curricula, and the number of individual community colleges that provided these services and curricula to their students. Table 4 shows that 96 percent offered vocational/occupational/ technical curricula, 91 percent offered adult Basic Education and Developmental/
Remedial Education, 88 percent offered Job-Skills Training/Job Readiness Activities, 82 percent offered Job Development/Placement services, 78 percent offered educational programs for students with limited English language proficiency, and 75 percent of all community colleges offered GED preparation at their college. Of the 277 responding colleges, 192 or 69 percent offered child care supportive services, and 57 percent offered small business entrepreneurship programs.

These data show that community colleges offer a wide range of services related to helping the students their institutions serve develop skills for initial employment, re-employment, and skill upgrading. That such an overwhelming percentage of community colleges offer so many of these work force training programs and related services is highly significant to public policy makers

TABLE 4

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES RELATED TO WORK FORCE TRAINING OFFERED AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Educational Programs and Services Currently Offered at Responding Community Colleges...	College Response	Percent of Response
Vocational/Occupational/Technical Curriculum	265	96%
Adult Basic Education and Developmental/Remedial Education	252	91%
Job-Skills Training/Job-Readiness Activities	245	88%
Job Development/Placement Services	226	82%
Education For Individuals With Limited English Proficiency	215	78%
GED Preparation	207	75%
Supportive Services (child care, transportation)	192	69%
Small Business Entrepreneurship/Incubation Center	158	57%
Distance Learning To Deliver Literacy At The Work Site	99	36%
Alternative High School	70	25%
Other Services	64	23%

NOTE: The "college response" represents the number of community colleges,
out of the 277 institutions that responded to the survey, that offered these services.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater Oklahoma.

interested in welfare-to-work program effectiveness. According to the regulations implementing the JOBS program, a state must include the following four services and/or activities: (1) any educational activity below the postsecondary level that the state agency determinesto be appropriate to the participant's employment goal (including, but not limited to, high school education or GED preparation, basic and remedial education, and English as a second language), (2) job skills training including vocational training, (3) job readiness activities to prepare participants to enter the world of work, and (4) job development and job placement to solicit employment for participants (*Federal Register*, April 18, 1989). It is clear that the wide range of services offered by community colleges are consistent with the comprehensive range of services contemplated by the Family Support Act and the Job Opportunities Basic Skills Program.

Each community college was asked if they were currently operating JOBS, JTPA, and/or other U.S. Department of Labor programs, other than JTPA. Responses from community colleges are summarized in Table 5, "Community Colleges Operating JOBS, JTPA, and U.S. Department of Labor Programs." One-hundred and forty-four community colleges, or 52 percent, indicated they currently operated programs under JOBS as of June, 1994. In 1989 when NETWORK, "America's Two-Year College Employment Training and Literacy Consortium," conducted their national survey of t wo-year colleges, only 15 percent of these colleges (56 out of 384 responding colleges) reported that they offered federal government assistance programs funded through the JOBS program (NETWORK, 1990). The results from this survey clearly show the significant growth in the number of community colleges providing services to JOBS participants since passage of the Family Support Act in 1988.

A follow-up statement on the survey instrument asked community colleges if they had ever received an award from their local welfare agency, state or local government, and/or national association for services provided to JOBS participants. Of the 207 community colleges that responded to this question, 40 community colleges, or 19 percent, indicated that they had received an award.

TABLE 5

COMMUNITY COLLEGES OPERATING JOBS, JTPA, AND OTHER DEPARTMENT OF LABOR PROGRAMS

Federal Government Assistance Program	College Response	Percent of Response
JOBS	144	52%
JTPA	219	79%
U.S. Department of Labor programs, other than JTPA	65	23%

NOTE: The "college response" represents the number of community colleges, of the 277 responding colleges, that operated federal assistance programs.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater Oklahoma.

That so many responding community colleges had received recognition is another indicator of the extent of their involvement at the local level in JOBS programs.

Community colleges were asked to estimate the number of participants served through the respective JOBS services delivered at their community college in fiscalyear 1993. This information is presented in Table 6, "Participants Served by JOBS Programs at Responding Community Colleges." Approximately 50 percent of 153 community colleges reported the number of participants served through their JOBS programs to be between 50 and 249 students. Twelve of the larger,

TABLE 6

PARTICIPANTS SERVED BY JOBS PROGRAMS AT RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Total Number of JOBS Participants	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
less than 50	27	18%
50 - 99	37	24%
100 - 249	37	24%
250 - 499	29	19%
500 - 1,000	11	7%
1,000 or more	12	8%
Total JOBS Participants, all responding institutions	58,701	100%

NOTES:

1. A total of 277 institutions responded to the survey.
2. The total number of responding community colleges to this item, 153, is higher than the number of colleges (144, or 52% of the 277 responses, as shown in Table 5, above) that indicated they currently operated JOBS programs. This is due to respondents' inconsistencies when answering related questions on the research instrument. It also may indicate that the 52% figure reported in Table 5 may understate college involvement in JOBS programs.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

TABLE 7

ESTIMATED FUNDING FOR JOBS PROGRAMS AT RESPONDING COLLEGES, FISCAL YEAR 1993

Range of Estimated JOBS Funds for Fiscal Year 1993	Number of Responding Colleges	Percent of Responding Colleges
less than $100,000	86	56%
$100,000 - $249,999	34	22%
$250,000 - $499,999	13	9%
$500,000 and above	20	13%

NOTES:

1. A total of 277 institutions responded to the survey.
2. The total number of responding community colleges to this item, 153, is higher than the number of colleges (144, or 52% of the 277 responses, as shown in Table 5, above) that indicated they currently operated JOBS programs. This is due to the respondents' inconsistencies when answering related questions on the research instrument. It also may indicate that the 52% figure reported in Table 5 may understate community college involvement in JOBS programs.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

urban-based community colleges and multi-campus colleges indicated their number of JOBS participants to be greater than 1,000 students. The largest number of JOBS participants reported was 5,000 students.

An estimate of funding for JOBS services at each community college for fiscal year 1993 is presented above in Table 7, "Estimated Funding for JOBS Programs at Responding Colleges, Fiscal Year 1993." Approximately 80 percent of the

community colleges receiving funds from the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program indicated they received less than $250,000 for their individual welfare-to-work programs in fiscal year 1993. Of the 153 responding community colleges, 33, or 22 percent, that reported JOBS funds estimated total funds to be in excess of $250,000, and 20 of reported funds in excess of $500,000. A statement in the survey instrument asked community colleges if they were interested "in playing a more active role" in federal welfare reform through programs like the JOBS program. Of the 232 community colleges that responded to this item in the survey, 224 of the colleges or 97 percent, indicated that they *were* interested in playing a more active role in welfare reform.

To further assess their involvement in workforce training and economic development leadership organizations, each community college was asked if they had an employee or employees who were currently members of a specific list of councils and/or chamber of commerce. The list and the community college's responses are presented in Table 8, "Involvement of Responding Community Colleges on Selected Workforce and Economic Development-Related Councils." As indicated by Table 8, the majority of the community colleges were well-represented on the local chamber of commerce and the local and area councils. However, only a small percentage of the community colleges, approximately 5 to 10 percent, were represented on the state job training coordinating councils, state chambers of commerce, and state councils that oversee welfare and public aid programs.

TABLE 8

INVOLVEMENT OF RESPONDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES ON WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-RELATED COUNCILS

Workforce Training and Economic Development-Related Councils	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Local Private Industry Council	168	61%
State Private Industry Council	27	10%
Local Welfare Agency Council	87	31%
State Welfare Agency Council	15	5%
Local Chamber of Commerce	227	82%
State Chamber of Commerce	14	5%
Area Council on Literacy	180	65%
Area Economic Development Council	182	66%

NOTES: The total number of responding community colleges is 277.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater Oklahoma.

Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development

A major section of this national survey of community college involvement in JOBS programs dealt with community college involvement in JOBS policy development. This section presents the analysis of that portion of the survey. Table 9, "Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development" presents perceptions of community college professionals in JOBS policy development. It reveals that a vast majority--84 percent--of the community college respondents either disagreed or were uncertain that sufficient federal funds were available through JOBS to offer welfare recipients economic independence through postsecondary education. In the same manner, 87 percent of the colleges disagreed or were uncertain that sufficient state funds were available to "match" federal JOBS funds. Of the funds that were presumed available, 67 percent of the respondents agreed with the statement that there should be increased state and community college control over how JOBS funds are spent. Responding community college professionals tended to believe that they were not well represented on local and especially state advisory boards that oversee JOBS programs. Just 16 percent of the respondents believed that sufficient federal funds were available through JOBS to offer AFDC recipients economic independence through postsecondary education. Only 13 percent of the respondents believed sufficient state funds were available to "match" federal JOBS appropriations, and only 23 percent believed that there was sufficient flexibility for states and their community colleges to administer JOBS programs effectively. Thus, 3 out of 4 responding colleges disagreed or were uncertain that there was sufficient flexibility in federal JOBS regulations to effectively administer JOBS programs at their institutions. This is an important finding given the overall emphasis on program coordination and the intent of JOBS to allow postsecondary institutional involvement.

Lastly, 55 percent of the community college professionals were either unaware or uncertain if a data collection system for JOBS currently existed in their state. Of the remaining 45 percent of respondents, only 21 percent agreed that the

TABLE 9
COMMUNITY COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN JOBS POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Number of Responding Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
Current federal law **promotes** community college participation in JOBS	16 6%	54 21%	66 26%	97 37%	27 10%
The agency within my state that administers JOBS **promotes** community college participation	18 7%	52 20%	43 16%	101 39%	46 18%
The JOBS agency **within my state** has hosted training sessions to promote community college participation in JOBS, so that AFDC recipients can more easily pursue postsecondary education	28 11%	54 21%	76 29%	74 28%	28 11%
The state community college or coordinating agency **within my state** promotes community college participation in JOBS	14 6%	37 14%	55 21%	111 43%	41 16%
Community colleges are well represented on **local advisory boards** that oversee JOBS	34 13%	64 25%	82 32%	52 20%	26 10%
Community colleges are well represented on **statewide advisory boards** that oversee JOBS	26 10%	60 23%	127 50%	32 13%	11 4%
Sufficient **federal** funds are available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education	46 18%	91 35%	80 31%	33 13%	8 3%
Sufficient **state** funds are available to "match" federal JOBS funds to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education	51 20%	82 32%	92 35%	23 9%	10 4%
Federal JOBS regulations provide sufficient **flexibility** for states and their community colleges to administer JOBS programs effectively	24 9%	80 31%	94 37%	49 19%	9 4%
There should be increased state/community college **control** over how JOBS funds are spent	11 4%	16 6%	59 23%	105 41%	67 26%
The criteria needed for **measuring the effective return on investment** of JOBS funds presently exists within my state's JOBS data collection system	16 6%	46 18%	141 55%	47 18%	7 3%

NOTES: The total number of responding community colleges was different for each statement, depending on if the respondent chose to answer it. The abbreviations used in the table are as follows: SD - Strongly Disagree, D - Disagree, U - Uncertain/Unknown, A -Agree, and SA - Strongly Agree.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

criteria needed for effectively measuring the return on investment of JOBS funds was actually being analyzed or had ever been assimilated in their state. Given the increased emphasis on student outcomes within the field of higher education, as required by regional accreditation bodies and the U.S. Department of Education regulations, it would seem that time is ripe to develop model joint data collection systems JOBS and community colleges, to facilitate greater coordination.

Barriers to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs

Table 10, "Internal and External Barriers to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs," presents perceptions of community college professionals regarding barriers related to effective JOBS program implementation. Of the survey respondents, 51 percent agreed that there were insufficient funds within their state to guarantee child care for welfare recipients participating through the JOBS program at their community colleges. Likewise, 50 percent of community college professionals agreed that there were insufficient funds within their states to finance the necessary transportation expenses for welfare recipients participating through the JOBS program at their institutions. Although one-half of all the responding colleges agreed that their were insufficient state funds available for child care and transportation expenses, 58 percent of these community colleges were uncertain or unaware if cuts in their state budgets had actually precluded their state from matching the available funds available for JOBS programs within their state.

Twenty-five percent of the college professionals agreed with the statement that federal need-based financial aid was counted against welfare eligibility in their state. Of the remaining colleges, 35 percent of them were uncertain or unsure and 40 percent disagreed that federal student aid was counted against welfare eligibility in their state.

Similarly, 35 percent of responding colleges agreed that the requirement of a minimum of 20 hours of participation in JOBS program activities per week wasted

TABLE 10

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DELIVERY OF JOBS PROGRAMS

Number of Responding Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
Federal need-based **student aid is counted against welfare eligibility in my state** (i.e., if the AFDC recipient applies for and receives a Pell Grant, their monthly allotment under AFDC is reduced by the amount awarded by Pell)	51 21%	48 19%	87 35%	50 20%	13 5%
To my knowledge, **budget cuts** in my state have precluded my state from matching all of the federal funds available for JOBS programs	12 5%	28 11%	146 58%	47 18%	26 8%
There are insufficient funds within my state to **guarantee child care** for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college	11 4%	47 19%	67 26%	85 34%	44 17%
There are insufficient funds within my state to pay necessary **transportation** for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college	6 2%	50 20%	71 28%	90 35%	37 15%
The Health and Human Services' **"20-hour rule"** (20 required hours of participation in JOBS program activities per week) wastes resources and is biased against JOBS programs at my community college	24 10%	60 24%	80 31%	53 21%	35 14%
The lack of **common forms** for in-take for both the JOBS and JTPA programs prevents full integration of these programs at my college	11 4%	46 18%	71 28%	80 32%	47 18%
The lack of trained personnel and/or professional development at my community college has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS	59 23%	100 39%	44 17%	37 15%	14 6%
The lack of understanding by administrators at my community college of the rules and regulations of the JOBS program has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS	47 18%	96 38%	34 13%	56 22%	22 9%
The emphasis by JOBS in my state toward the most **short-term education** possible to promote the goal of immediate job placement is contrary to the kind of sequential educational programs that community college typically operate	8 3%	44 17%	36 14%	95 38%	71 28%

The state community college coordinating board or agency requires or encourages my community college to enroll JOBS participants in "**no credit" programs**, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom for regular college courses	55 22%	96 38%	82 32%	14 5%	7 3%
My community college has chosen to enroll JOBS participants in "**no credit" programs**, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom	77 31%	105 42%	54 22%	11 4%	2 1%
Adult literacy (which includes JOBS-sponsored adult basic education and GED training) is an activity that is a high priority at my community college	14 6%	45 18%	13 5%	84 33%	95 38%
My community college has simply chosen **not to participate** in the JOBS program	139 55%	72 29%	29 12%	9 3%	2 1%

NOTES: The total number of responding community colleges was different for each statement, depending on if the respondent chose to answer it. The abbreviations used in the table are as follows: SD - Strongly Disagree, D - Disagree, U - Uncertain/Unknown, A -Agree, and SA - Strongly Agree.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

resources and was biased against community college students. Under JOBS, states must in general have a certain proportion of individuals whose participation in JOBS-related activities as a group averages at least 20 hours a week. The penalty for not meeting this requirement is the loss of a portion of federal funding. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services developed the 20-hour standard to reflect congressional intent of the Family Support Act of 1988 that JOBS participants be engaged in meaningful activities rather than merely being registered for activities, as had often happened under past programs (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991).

The majority of responding community college professionals, 66 percent, agreed that the emphasis by the welfare agency in their state toward the most short-term

education and/or training possible to promote immediate job placement was contrary to the sequential educational curricula that community colleges generally operate. Seventy-three percent of the responding colleges disagreed with the statement that they encouraged or required JOBS participants to enroll in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants academic credit for time spent in the classroom. Sixty percent of the institutions disagreed with the statement that their state community college boards encouraged or required them to enroll JOBS participants in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom.

The issue of credit versus non-credit program enrollment is of critical importance to community college professionals, in that without college credit for achieving college level competence, the system then functions to "cool out" student aspirations, as opposed to promoting social mobility. It is clear from the comments received by the survey respondents that once the JOBS students set foot on the community college campus, they are treated like regular students of the institution. This in all likelihood "heats up" their aspirations, while connecting them to institutions that offer a wide range of educational programs and career choices.

Over 60 percent of all community colleges disagreed with the statement that the lack of trained personnel and/or professional development at their institution had resulted in a lower level of participation by their college in JOBS. Still, 21 percent felt otherwise, indicating a need for further research in this area. In addition, 56 percent of the respondents disagreed that the statement that a lack of understanding by their administrators of the rules and regulations of the JOBS program had resulted in lower levels of institutional participation by their institution in JOBS.

Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges

Table 11, "Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges Regarding the JOBS Program," presents the results of the portion of the survey instrument that dealt with communication and collaboration. Table 11 shows that the issue of program integration is very important to community college professionals. The vast majority of the respondents--92 percent--agreed that it would be beneficial for program integration to organize task forces comprised of all the agencies dealing with JOBS and the local community colleges. Such task forces would meet on a regular basis to ensure productive and effective welfare program integration within the various regions of the states.

Nearly one-half or 49 percent of the community colleges responding to the survey agreed that there existed a large amount of fragmentation, including communication and "turf battles" between various state agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs and community colleges. Thirty-nine percent of the responding colleges also agreed that the existing fragmentation had lessened the ability of their institutions to coordinate and develop effective programs that link postsecondary education to a welfare-to-work system.

Only 41 percent of the responding community colleges agreed that their governors had taken an active role in promoting and coordinating JOBS and other welfare programs in their state. In the same manner, only 32 percent of the responding colleges agreed that their state legislators had taken an active role in coordinating and promoting welfare programs.

TABLE 11

STATE AGENCY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE COLLABORATION REGARDING JOBS

Number of Responding Colleges
Percent of Total Respondents

Likert-Type Statements	SD	D	U	A	SA
My **state agencies** have shown little or no interest in organizing and implementing JOBS programs in my community college	58 23%	87 34%	49 19%	44 17%	18 7%
The map of the legally defined **service area for JOBS** does not match the state-assigned service area of my community college	32 13%	63 24%	99 38%	43 17%	20 8%
The **legally defined JTPA service area map** does not match the legally defined service area for JOBS and my community college's state-assigned area	28 11%	67 26%	103 40%	39 15%	21 8%
The existing **fragmentation** (maps not matching) has lessened the ability of my community college to coordinate and develop effective programs that link education to transitional welfare	32 13%	66 26%	93 37%	42 16%	21 8%
There exists a large amount of **fragmentation** (including lack of communication and "turf battles") between various agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) in my state	16 6%	43 17%	72 28%	76 30%	47 19%
Task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the community college **meet on a regular basis** to integrate their activities, so that AFDC recipients can be better served through the JOBS program	39 15%	67 26%	49 19%	69 27%	34 13%
It would be a good thing for **program integration** if task forces comprised of representatives of all agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the local community college met regularly basis	1 0%	2 1%	18 7%	113 44%	124 48%
My **Governor** has taken an active role in coordinating JOBS & welfare-to-work programs	15 6%	30 12%	105 41%	78 30%	28 11%
The **State legislators** in my state have taken an active role in coordinating JOBS and other welfare-to-work programs	11 4%	55 22%	107 42%	66 26%	16 6%

NOTE: Note: The total number of responding community colleges was different for each statement, depending on if the respondent chose to answer it. The abbreviations used in the table are as follows: SD - Strongly Disagree, D - Disagree, U - Uncertain/Unknown, A -Agree, and SA - Strongly Agree.

SOURCE: Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Conclusions and Recommendations

> People think welfare mothers don't go to college because they are stupid, lazy and don't want to get off the dole. That's nonsense. The problem is that everybody tells them they can't do it. Somebody has to tell them they can. I was a seventh grade dropout and an unwed mother on welfare. People told me I was either stupid or crazy. But I made it through college and got my master's degree (Sasaki, 1986, p.33).

This national survey found that there was significant commitment, interest, and participation by the responding community colleges in the transitional welfare-to-work opportunities offered through the Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program. The data indicated that the community colleges were able, and willing, to provide the necessary educational and support services required by the federal assistance welfare program to offer economic independence to welfare (AFDC) recipients through postsecondary education.

Yet, in line with the shift in the social contract toward expecting all or most welfare recipients to seek training and employment and families to be economically self-sufficient, the findings of this study acknowledged some of the barriers to postsecondary education and training for welfare recipients. These barriers include but are not limited to the need for assistance with expenses such as child care and transportation that participation in education and training programs entail. When 50 percent of the participating community colleges agreed there were insufficient funds for both child care and transportation for JOBS participants in their state, funding is a problem. Obviously, the funding barrier is a critical issue that should be addressed by the states, the community colleges within the states, and the federal government.

Tables 1-8 presented demographic characteristics of the responding community colleges, and basic data regarding the nature of the respondent's participation in the JOBS programs and related programs. From this analysis, it can be concluded from these data that community colleges involvment with the JOBS program is significant and growing. The percentage of community colleges involved rose from

a reported 15 percent by the 1990 NETWORK survey to 52 percent in this survey, a period of just four years.

In addition to showing that the involvement of community colleges in JOBS was growing, the data also showed that the institutions were desirous of greater future involvement, that they already offered a number of JOBS related services, and that they were active in the economic development efforts of their local areas. A striking 97 percent of the respondents indicated that they were interested in becoming *more* involved in JOBS. Most offered vocational curricula (96%), adult basic and developmental education "(91%), job skills and job readiness activities (88%) and a panoply of other related services including but not limited to GED preparation, supportive services including child care, and courses for students with limited English proficiency. This range of services *already in place* should be of special interest to state and federal policymakers, who are interested in meeting the regulatory requirements of *comprehensive* services envisioned by the JOBS program.

The demographic data also showed the diversity of institutions and their involvement in welfare-to-work programs. Clearly, one size does not fit all; what works in a rural area will not work in the inner city. Community colleges have demonstrated a remarkable degree of flexibility in developing programs appropriate to local needs. Yet their very flexibility and diversity--one of their greatest assets as institutions--makes them very difficult for public policymakers to understand. This is important when one keeps in mind that the modern system of community colleges emerged long after the welfare system of the New Deal era, and after the emergence of the modern federal role in employment and training programs, and changes in the welfare system that came with the Great Society as well.

While additional research is needed, it is clear that community colleges are a delivery system already in place. As a set of institutions, they serve large numbers of adult learners from a variety of circumstances. Their open-door philosophy makes these institutions relatively easy for non-traditional students to

use (particularly those who have never attended college). Their open access philosophy, reflected in lower tuition charges, also facilitates adult learning. With the increased emphasis on program coordination, it will become increasingly important for welfare-to-work administrators at the state and federal levels to gain a better understanding of the capacities of community colleges as institutions. A national survey by Swender in 1991 found that most of the Governor's Liaisons for JTPA had worked in the employment and training field prior to passage of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) in 1973...yet community colleges emerged as a mass system in the late 1970s and 1980s. There is no reason to think that it would not be likely for experienced state and local administrators of JOBS to have similar long years of experience, experience that predates the rise of modern community college. For this reason, and the diversity in state-assigned functions, and additional research is needed. There is also a need to disseminate good practices by institutional community college type (rural, suburban, and urban). In this regard, Part II of this study, which discusses exemplary practices, represents an important first step.

Progress in helping JOBS participants become self-sufficient can be slowed by states' limited spending on JOBS and budget shortfalls. As noted in the literature, more than one-third of the federal JOBS funds available to the states went unused in 1991 because many states did not plan to spend enough state money to obtain all of the federal matching funds available. Twenty-six percent of the community colleges responding to this study perceived that such fiscal problems can slow the influx of new participants into JOBS programs and limit the number of individuals who can become self-sufficient.

The problem for many states is the lack of resources. While spending is up under JOBS, many states are challenged to find enough matching funds to draw down their full federal JOBS allocation. It has become impossible for some states to provide educational and training services to welfare recipients at the current level of funding for the JOBS program. Still, some states are doing better than others. For example, some states are doing a better job of "drawing down" federal

matching funds, such as Ohio. The more exemplary state level practices that can be shared, the better.

Federal action can also help respond to the concerns expressed. The Secretary of U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS) has the legal authority to grant waivers to the states to try innovative approaches to welfare and to improve the delivery of services. Under the law, the secretary can waive certain federal laws to allow states to try their own reform measures where they can demonstrate results.

To further encourage state innovation and experimentation, it is recommended that the federal government establish a registry of state waiver requests to facilitate information sharing among and between states. In addition, federal appropriations should be enhanced to allow the states to meet the demand for education, training, and employment services, as well as support services for JOBS participants. More incentives should be provided by the federal government to continue, expand, and improve the delivery of special services to welfare recipients and to experiment with new approaches. Direct financial incentives should be available to welfare recipients who achieve the educational goal of a high school diploma or General Educational Development diploma. In lieu of federal action in this regard, individual states should move on their own.

The DHHS and the state welfare agencies need to establish and widely disseminate specific and consistent regulations concerning federal need-based financial aid calculations for AFDC recipients. As long as there is a *perception* of significance variance between AFDC and federal student aid rules, determinations from welfare officer to welfare officer will vary, and the uncertainty and confusion characterized by the responding community colleges will remain. When 25 percent of community colleges agreed that federal student aid was still being counted against welfare eligibility and another 35 percent of the colleges were unsure, there exists a need for the federal government to better market community college involvement and understanding of the JOBS program. That 60 percent of the responding community colleges strongly agreed, agreed, or were

unsure if obtaining federal student financial aid would reduce their students' AFDC benefits speaks to the need for increased education of community college professionals of JOBS and FSA.

Of those community colleges professionals indicating preferences regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development, only 16 percent agreed that there were sufficient federal funds available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through education. Only 13 percent of the colleges agreed that there were sufficient state funds to "match" the federal JOBS funds available for welfare recipients. This lack of understanding of how JOBS works is further evidenced by the responses of community college professionals to questions related to JOBS objectives and JOBS program rules. If community colleges are to help their states in developing and implementing JOBS programs that maximize the involvement of their institutions, they will have to learn the specific JOBS law and regulations regarding the matching of JOBS funds, and work within their states to change the rules governing other programs to accomplish this purpose. The present level of community college involvement in JOBS policy development at the state level is not high enough to bring this about.

Only 23 percent of responding colleges agreed that JOBS regulations provided sufficient flexibility for states and their community colleges to effectively administer JOBS programs. Yet according to the literature, within the framework of the federal provisions, states possess the flexibility to design various aspects of their JOBS programs. Many decisions about the design and operation of JOBS programs are left to governors, state legislatures as well as state AFDC agencies. Furthermore, the individual states are allowed to decide who will be served and what types of activities and services will be emphasized for participants. It is significant when 77 percent of all responding institutions disagree or were uncertain if JOBS regulations provided adequate flexibility for effective administration of JOBS programs by the colleges (of course, it should be noted that this is no more significant than AFDC and JOBS administrators not fully understanding Perkins and Pell Grant rules and regulations...the authors believe

that to promote good program integration requires coordination and understanding among all service providers). It seems apparent that there exists a lack of understanding on behalf of the community college professionals regarding the Family Support Act of 1988.

The survey revealed a strong preference on the part of responding community colleges to the need for longer-term, as opposed to short-term job training. While the Family Support Act of 1988 did not state a preference for short-term job training only, although it is clear that FSA assumes that getting welfare recipients off welfare and into work as soon as possible is a positive goal. Since nearly all of the economic data reviewed for this study concerning self-sufficiency argues that American workers in the next century will need continuous training and skill upgrading, and that therefore if one starts behind, the skill gap is all the more difficult to close. It may well be that community college respondents do not understand how to integrate JOBS services with the postsecondary educational services they provide, and/or that their state welfare agencies have not figured out how to best involve their state's community colleges. It is probable that these two entities--community colleges and welfare agencies--have not enjoyed a long tradition of working collaboratively (the NETWORK 1990 study found that only 15 percent of responding community colleges provided JOBS services to AFDC recipients). Prior to passage of FSA in 1988, a number of state welfare agencies as a matter of policy disallowed postsecondary education altogether. Others provided little information about it, and tended to allow only short-term job-focused postsecondary education. Put differently, while the law might have changed, perceptions did not, and this is an area policymakers can address.

As reported in the findings, 49 percent of community colleges believed a large amount of fragmentation, including poor communication and "turf battles" existed within their state. In an effort to increase program integration, which was highly valued by the responding colleges, greater program coordination to serve JOBS participants is needed. The colleges should respond proactively to coordinate with such agencies as JTPA, state welfare, education and training, child care, and

employment agencies. One significant finding was that the vast majority of community colleges offered most if not all of the related educational services JOBS was designed to promote. There needs to be greater coordination and collaboration among community colleges and these agencies that traditionally have been important providers of services to welfare-to-work participants. Therefore, the state agencies should affirmatively welcome the involvement of community colleges, and vice versa, to effectively coordinate the JOBS program and provide needed services to participants.

It is also apparent that there is a need for state governments to become more active in coordinating and promoting the JOBS programs, as well as other welfare-to-work programs within their states. Seventy-five percent of all responding community colleges either agree or are uncertain that their governor and state legislators are actively promoting welfare programs and the need for postsecondary education for welfare recipients in their states. State government is where the action will be in the 1990s on a wide range of public policy issues, including welfare reform. And the primary question is not whether states should be involved but rather how. Unlike past welfare reform efforts, the JOBS program implicitly rejected a federally directed approach. Instead, governors and other state officials were to be the key movers. No longer can state officials simply support or endorse the "ideas" of welfare-to-work programs (JOBS). They must put forward major initiatives of their own. It is highly likely that once a proactive state government proposes and implements positive and opportunistic changes in current welfare programs, and consequently begins to receive largely favorable reviews, governors in other states will follow. For this reason, it is suggested that DHHS's Public Service Excellence Awards be widely recognized within the community college publications, particularly Community College Times, Community College Journal, and Community College Week, to promote successful state and local practice in delivering welfare-to-work programs.

It was observed that the institutions very much want to be involved in developing policy and providing services to JOBS participants. Fifty-two percent

of responding community colleges indicated that they currently operated programs under JOBS. Of the community colleges that responded to the statement of playing a "more active role" in federal welfare reform through programs like the JOBS program, an overwhelming 97 percent indicated that they were quite interested in becoming more involved in developing policy and providing services to JOBS participants. However only 30 percent of the colleges agreed that their institutions were well represented on local advisory boards. Similarly, only 17 percent of the colleges agreed that they were well represented on statewide boards that oversee the JOBS programs. Until these community colleges actively participate in the recruitment of knowledgeable community college personnel to represent their institutions on these state and local boards, the percentage of community college participation will continue to be unacceptable, and the colleges will remain isolated and ineffective in the policymaking arena. The onus for promoting the needed dialog does not solely belong to welfare administrators. The chief executive officers of community colleges should collaborate to effectively impact state level policy, in tandem with state community college system executive directors, and their local legislative delegations. As the American Association of Community Colleges' landmark 1988 report, Building Communities, noted:

> The community college, at its best, can be a center for problem-solving in adult illiteracy or the education of the disabled. It can bring together agencies to strengthen services for minorities, working women, single parent heads of households, and unwed teenage parents. It can also coordinate efforts to provide day care, transportation, and financial aid. The community college can take the lead in long-range planning for community development. And it can serve as the focal point for improving the quality of life in the inner city (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988).

If state and/or local advisory boards for welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) do not currently exist, then there should be a collaborative effort by the state and local governments and the community colleges to establish a system of local advisory boards to organize and oversee welfare programs such as the JOBS program. If the existing service delivery areas of JTPA and PICs could be collapsed and made contiguous with state-assigned community college service

areas, it would positively promote local coordination. In addition, community colleges should continue to increase their level of representation and implement their role as convener in local and state coalitions in order to help forge better linkages and understanding among state and local government and welfare agencies involved with the JOBS programs. No longer can community colleges afford to be voiceless.

Community colleges are emerging as key providers of workforce training in the United States. They possess the expertise and the commitment to provide the kind of special attention that new workers will need. As open-door institutions, community colleges should strengthen their commitment to serve these disadvantaged students. If needed, the colleges should increase their training and educational programs, bringing adult literacy programs to their communities, and begin offering classroom instruction during the day, at night, and on the weekend. In addition, careful examination of community college's mission statements should be considered. Those colleges that have not formally stated economic development in their mission statements need to do so. They should formally add adult literacy to their mission statements as well. These new entrants to the workforce can not be taken for granted, because there is little human capital to waste in the coming decades.

VOICES FROM THE FIELD:

A Qualitative Representation of JOBS Programs at Community Colleges

Part II

PART TWO: VOICES FROM THE FIELD
Qualitative Summaries of Exemplary JOBS Programs at Community Colleges

Executive Summary

It is difficult to capture the diversity of America's 1,200 community colleges. They differ widely by geographic region, size, by state assigned mission, and by mechanisms used to fund them. Of the 1,200 institutions, about 700 serve rural areas, with the rest divided equally between urban and suburban areas. They vary widely by size, from a small, rural institution such as Haywood Community College (NC), with an enrollment of approximately 1,200 students, to the giant North Campus of Miami-Dade Community College (FL), the largest community college campus east of the Mississippi, with approximately 20,000 students. State assigned functions vary widely as well. Some states, including North and South Carolina, and Ohio, began their community colleges with a strong emphasis on technical education, while others, including Kentucky, created completely separate systems for postsecondary general education/baccalaureate transfer and technical education. The majority of the states, including California, Illinois, and Tennessee, developed *comprehensive* community college systems, which include technical as well as general education offerings. Finally, some states are like Florida, where a mix of both exists, with community colleges assigned responsibility for operating all postsecondary technical programs in some counties and dual responsibility in others.

Governance and methods of finance are also highly varied. In Alabama, Kentucky, and Minnesota a single coordinating board governs all of the colleges. Community colleges in Kansas receive 60 percent of their funding from local property taxes. In general, community colleges receive between 50 and 65% of their funding from state appropriations, and 15 to 25% from local appropriations, with the remainder from tuition and fees and other sources. Most states have bought into a comprehensive model of state coordination *and* strong local lay

governance. However, in order to fully access community college services to benefit JOBS program participants, welfare providers need to be sensitive to differences in geography, funding mechanism, governance, and state-assigned mission. No institutional type has exclusive title to success stories; there is no single model, and what works well in a rural area may not work at all in an urban one. Each voice from the field has a unique story to tell.

The case summaries of exemplary practice of JOBS programs at community colleges presented here were summarized from the larger case studies presented in Part II of the companion report to this study, *A Study of Community College Participation in the JOBS Program, a Report to America's Community Colleges.* Respondents were given a detailed set of questions, however, their responses varied a great deal in style and approach because the questions were open-ended, so as not to bias *their* perspectives regarding what made their JOBS program successful, and to not silence perceptions of key factors contributing to program success. A minimum of editorial license was used in developing the initial case studies, and wherever possible, the respondent's own words were used.

What practices were extant in most of the programs? Chart 1, "Community College Involvement in JOBS Programs - A Qualitative Analysis," on the two pages following, presents a qualitative summary of the case studies.[9] Four broad areas were examined: (1) Program Mission; (2) Program Characteristics, (3) Program Barriers and Program Collaboration; and (4), Program Outcomes, Accomplishments, and Awards. A cursory review might show that the services the 19 community colleges provide to JOBS participants are much alike. A closer examination, however, reveals significant and sometimes striking differences.

Each community college reported that participation in JOBS was integral to the open-door mission of their institution. This directly relates to their role as open-door, open-access colleges. Each program emphasized Adult Basic Education

---

[9] Note: The qualitative summary is based upon the full case studies as well as the summaries presented on the pages following.

CHART 1

COMMUNITY COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN JOBS PROGRAMS
A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

FUNCTION				R	u	r	a	l				S			U	r	b	a	n		
Program Mission	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		14	15	16	17	18	19	SUMMARY
Participation in JOBS integral to open door mission of CC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Emphasis on Adult Basic Education and GED attainment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Longer term education important as short term job placement	X	X						X	X	X		X	X		X			X			47%
Program Characteristics																					
Emphasis on building self-esteem	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	84%
JOBS students mainstreamed into regular college curriculum	X	X	X			X	X			X	X		X			X	X	X	X		63%
Problems with learning disabilities suspected/actually diagnosed	X	X		X	X		X		X		X	X					X		X	X	58%
Alcohol, drug and/or mental health problems suspected/diagnosed	X	X		X					X		X								X	X	37%

Program Barriers and Program Collaboration				**R**	**u**	**r**	**a**	**l**				**S**			**U**	**r**	**b**	**a**	**n**		**SUMMARY**
Problems with child care	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X					X	63%
Problems with transportation		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X			X		X	68%
Direct involvement of JTPA staff			X				X				X	X			X	X	X	X	X		47%
Direct involvement of private sector	X		X	X						X		X			X	X			X		42%
Collaboration predates JOBS/1988			X			X			X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	63%
Regular collaboration of local welfare providers and CC staff		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	89%
Program Outcomes, Accomplishments, and Awards																					
Over 40% lacked HS diploma			X	X	X				X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	63%
JOBS program honored locally		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	68%
JOBS program honored state/region	X			X		X		X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	63%
JOBS program honored nationally				X					X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X	47%
Rural 1 - 11; Suburban 12-13 & Urban 14-19	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	

KEY: 1=Blue Mtn CC (OR); 2=Chemekata CC (OR); 3=Cleveland St CC (TN); 4=Colorado Mtn C; 5=Haywood CC (NC); 6=Indep CC (KS); 7=Jeffrsn Co(MO); 8=John Tyler CC (VA); 9=Linn-Benton CC (OR); 10=Northeastern OK A&M College; 11=Piedmont VA CC; 12= Col of Lake County (IL); 13=Joliet Junior C (IL); 14=Dundalk CC; 15=FL CC at Jacksonville; 16=Los Angeles Southwest College; 17=Miami-Dade CC (FL); 18=Mt. Hood CC (OR); and 19=Portland CC (OR)

and General Equivalency Examination (GED) attainment, a result consistent with the quantitative survey (see Table 4 in Appendix One). Without such services, they would not be open-door, open-access institutions, and American higher education would become, in the words of Kenneth Kempner of the University of Oregon, "a single elimination tournament." As 'second chance' institutions, it is not surprising to find that 9 of the 19 community college case study respondents placed longer term education on equal footing as short-term employment placements as they perceived their involvement with programs to serve JOBS participants. Several institutions, especially Los Angeles Southwest College (CA), and Linn-Benton and Mt. Hood Community Colleges (OR) reported notable improvements in the grade level functioning of their JOBS program participants.

By operational characteristics of their JOBS programs, nearly all of the programs summarized, 16 of 19, or 84%, emphasized building self-esteem in the programs and services delivered to JOBS participants at their institutions. Twelve of the 19 institutions, or 63% of the institutions reported that JOBS participants were mainstreamed wherever possible into the regular community college curriculum. Typically, staff from the local welfare provider agency would refer the JOBS clients to the community college, and the community college would develop an individualized learning plan for each JOBS client/student. Both would work to insure that appropriate services were provided. Welfare provider staff would arrange available child care and transportation support services, and the community college would facilitate the delivery of student support services and education and training programs. These services were often funded by a variety of funding sources, including JTPA and in some cases federal student aid programs.

Two of the 19 community colleges tried to keep their JOBS students in cohort groups, so as to provide an environment to bolster self-esteem. Haywood Community College (NC) provides an example of a rural community college using a cohort approach. Most institutions worked to insure that JOBS participants at their campuses could access *all* of their college's services. Miami-Dade Community College (FL) and Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College are examples

of urban and rural community colleges that possess a wide and complex array of support services which JOBS participants can access to foster student success.

Eleven of the 19 institutions, or 58% of those reporting, suspected or actually diagnosed learning disabilities for the students in the JOBS program at their community college. Seven of the 19, or 37% of those reporting, suspected or actually diagnosed alcohol, drug, and/or mental health problems for the students served in their JOBS program. Since this was not a specific question in the qualitative format to the community colleges, it can be inferred that these are conservative estimates. The issue of learning disabilities and problems with alcohol, drugs, and mental health revealed differences in orientation between the welfare provider community and the community college community. Experienced welfare providers know that many AFDC recipients possess such problems. The community colleges that had been involved with collaborative efforts (most likely JTPA) prior to passage in 1988 of the Family Support Act and the creation of the JOBS Program clearly were aware of these issues. However, several community colleges new to serving JOBS participants appear to have been surprised to learn of alcohol and drug abuse, and learning disabilities among welfare recipients. This would suggest that despite their open-access rhetoric, prior to JOBS, community colleges had not traditionally served welfare recipients. For examples of practice in this regard, readers are urged to consult the case summary of Portland Community College (OR), and for a rural setting, Piedmont Virginia Community College (whose cooperative program with the University of Virginia to diagnose learning disabilities was a "spin off" of its participation in the JOBS Program).

There were striking differences between responding rural, suburban, and urban community colleges in terms of the barriers faced by the students they served through their JOBS programs. Twelve of the 19 institutions, or 63%, reported problems with child care, and 13 of the 19, or 68%, reported problems with transportation for their JOBS participants. Problems related to meeting the "20 hour rule" in a rural context where their JOBS participants "owned old cars that

often broke down," and no public transit was available, were mentioned.

Direct collaboration with JTPA programs differed significantly by geographic setting. *Every suburban and urban community college reported that collaboration preceded the creation of JOBS in 1988* (5 of those 7 programs reported direct involvement with JTPA. This suggests that geographic proximity is related to program collaboration in some way. There are a number of examples presented below of collaboration with welfare providers, the community college, and JTPA. Two notable examples are Cleveland State Community College (TN) in a rural setting, and Joliet Junior College (IL) in a suburban/urban setting.[10]

Eight of the 19 institutions reported direct involvement with the private sector in their JOBS program. This is likely a conservative figure because this issue was not specifically requested from the respondents. An example of private sector involvement with JOBS program services offered on a community college campus can be found at the College of Lake County (IL).

Nearly all of the respondents (17 of 19, or 89%) reported regular collaboration among local welfare providers and community college staff. By the tone of the reports reviewed, this collaboration is clearly viewed as essential to program success, probably because collaboration functionally ties together the commitment of **both** entities and the services offered by the community college. Interestingly, several community colleges reported they would go on serving educationally disadvantaged students whether or not JOBS funds were available (although at a much reduced service level). This evidences the commitment of community colleges to maintain an open-door that is truly open-access.

Several respondents voiced concerns regarding specific rules within JOBS and the federal student aid programs that were at cross purposes in serving JOBS

---

[10] Welfare providers will be interested to know that the local Service Delivery Agency entity for JTPA is actually located on the campus of Cleveland State. To a significant degree, Iowa, Nebraska, and Tennessee when establishing JTPA in the early 1980s matched the maps of their JTPA SDAs to their state-assigned community college service regions. Mississippi's legislature is currently considering efforts to redraw the maps of its JTPA and related adult education programs to coincide with the regions served by the state's community colleges.

students efficiently and effectively. Concerns over minimum grades to receive need-based student aid, increasing levels of student loan indebtedness among JOBS students, and the "20 hour rule" were all cited. John Tyler and Linn-Benton Community Colleges provide evidence of some of these barriers.

In terms of program outcomes and accomplishments, most respondents (12 of the 19, or 63%) indicated that over 40% of their JOBS students lacked a high school diploma upon program entry. This is likely a conservative estimate. One community college, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M, found that 36% of its JOBS students *were the first generation in their families to graduate from high school.* The linkages between income and employment status, low education attainment, and inter-generational poverty make this an area ripe for future investigation.

In terms of awards and recognition for their JOBS programs, 68% (13 of 19) of the community colleges reported receiving local recognition and awards, and a nearly equal percentage, 63% (12 of 19) received state or regional recognition. Eight of the 19 institutions, nearly half, received national honors, awards, and recognition for the achievements of their JOBS students. These included awards from the National Association of Counties, a Literacy Partnership Award from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS), Program of the Year from the American Association of Community College Women, and many others. Additional recognition included numerous visits from state, regional, and national welfare provider agencies, including a visit by Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary, Administration for Children and Family, USDHHS to Portland Community College. Numerous features were reported in respected newspapers including The New York Times, The Philadelphia Enquirer, and The Baltimore Sun.

Discussion and Analysis

Two key factors contributing to successful JOBS programs at community colleges were found in nearly every case. The first was the effort to "mainstream" JOBS participants into the regular programs of the community colleges. This was often accomplished on a gradual basis through introductory career and college

success courses, with the JOBS participants typically clustered in the initial developmental education classes to form a support network. If JOBS participants enrolled in regular college courses, they took them with "regular" community college students, promoting an "I can make it too" attitude. Once "mainstreamed," and adjusted to the college-going regimen, the JOBS students likely felt right at home. Community colleges emerged in the 1970s and 1980s to become the largest delivery system of formal education to adult learners in the United States. Today, the average age of a community college student is 28 years of age, and many come to the institutions after "stopping out" and are thus unprepared for college work upon entry. Research has demonstrated that the longer the delay between high school and college, the more likely students will need developmental education courses in English, mathematics, study skills, and oral communication, in order to succeed at the postsecondary level.

Community colleges have been dealing with underprepared learners for decades, and, at least at those institutions represented here, supportive environments are provided for adult learners who upon entry may possess low confidence levels as to their ability to succeed at college-level work. By mainstreaming the JOBS participants instead of segregating them. Respondents felt that these students could quickly grasp that they are no different than anyone else. This factor positively impacts self-concept and self-esteem and is probably a major factor in JOBS program success at community colleges.

A second major and perhaps paramount factor contributing to success of JOBS participants in programs provided by community colleges is the institutional commitment. Those community colleges that are involved and committed to JOBS program success work hard to offer coordinated services. The mission statements of these institutions are more likely to formally state a commitment to adult literacy[11], and they work to eliminate internal and external barriers to

---

[11] Most state community college system mission statements do not directly reference a commitment to adult literacy. The same is true at many community colleges. Staff at institutions that do have adult literacy referenced in their mission statements are able to show how their non-

collaboration and cooperation. An important internal barrier within the institutions themselves that the welfare provider community may not be familiar with is the compensation mechanism for community colleges. In most states, funding is built around a student enrollment-driven model, as contrasted to the funding mechanism for the JOBS program. Increasingly, states are limiting compensation available to community colleges only for delivering "regular" college course work, and pre-college developmental education courses are delivered "on the margin." External barriers can include a lack of collaboration and cooperation between the various employment and training, adult literacy, and welfare-to-work agencies, as well as access to child care and transportation services. The responses are consistent with the responses of community college professionals in the quantitative survey as reported in Tables 10 and 11 in Appendix One, below. Another external barrier is the perception that by serving welfare recipients who are "on the dole," the community college is denying services to "regular" students. The case summaries of Linn-Benton Community College and Florida Community College at Jacksonville are commended to the welfare provider community as practical examples of how community colleges have dealt with perceptions that serving welfare recipients might damage their external institutional reputation.

While the Family Support Act is relatively new, the nation's welfare-to-work systems well predate the rise of the modern community college. For this reason, welfare policymakers and case workers at the federal, state, and local levels have much to learn from community colleges about how those systems function, *and vice-versa*. It is hoped that this analysis and the case summaries presented below will reduce this knowledge gap, and build bridges of understanding among and between both systems.

---

traditional programs, often funded with non-higher education dollars, are directly tied to the mission, despite the negative views of some faculty and staff who might feel that AFDC participants "don't look like regular college students," etc. In the view of the authors, there is perhaps no better indication of a truly open door community college than the specific inclusion of adult literacy in its mission statement.

VOICES FROM THE FIELD: A Qualitative Representation of JOBS Programs at Community Colleges

List of Institutions

Rural Community Colleges
Blue Mountain Community College (OR)
Chemeketa Community College (OR)
Cleveland State Community College (TN)
Colorado Mountain College (CO)
Haywood Community College (NC)
Independence Community College (KS)
Jefferson College (MO)
John Tyler Community College (VA)
Linn-Benton Community College (OR)
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College (OK)
Piedmont Virginia Community College (VA)

Suburban Community Colleges
College of Lake County (IL)
Joliet Junior College (IL)

Urban Community Colleges
Dundalk Community College (MD)
Florida Community College at Jacksonville (FL)
Miami-Dade Community College, North Campus (FL)
Mt. Hood Community College (OR)
Portland Community College (OR)

VOICES FROM THE FIELD:

RURAL

COMMUNITY

COLLEGES

BLUE MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE (OR)

CONTACT: Ms. Carla Bee-Bowden, FSA Director, Blue Mountain Community College, 2411 N.W. Carden, P.O. Box 100, Pendleton, OR 97801 [Telephone: (503) 276-1260, ext. 354]

TITLE OF PROGRAM: JOBS PROGRAM

PURPOSE: The JOBS Program at BMCC is a local partnership in Umatilla and Morrow Counties designed to transition individuals, by way of education and training, from public assistance to economic self-sufficiency.

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* Cultural issues limit economic mobility for Hispanics and Native Americans
* Major employment tends to be seasonal in this rural agrarian area.
* High teenage pregnancy rates.

SUMMARY

Blue Mountain Community College is the original JOBS prime contractor and has been operating the program since October 1988. The current contract expires June 1995 with the anticipation of renewing the contract for another six years. The JOBS participants benefit from a comprehensive program that includes Adult Basic Education/Graduation Equivalency Degree (ABE/GED), Adult High School Diploma, Life Skills, Pre-Employment, Alcohol and Drug Counseling, Teen Parent Program, ESL, and Work Experience Training. The staff encourages most students to further their college education by assisting them with Pell Grants and/or scholarships.

Umatilla and Morrow counties possess teenage pregnancy rates among the highest in the state. Therefore, serving teenage parents without a high school diploma is a high priority. The College sees its involvement in JOBS as part of its commitment to break the cycle of welfare dependency at an early age.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The total number of clients served from July 1993 to June 1994 was 1,371 adults and 178 teens. This number comprised 63.9% of the total number of JOBS households. Of this total, 55 adults and 36 teens obtained a GED, and 4 adults

and 19 teens received High School Diplomas. The BMCC district has one of the highest rates of teen participation in any educational component in the State of Oregon. During the last biennium, Blue Mountain averaged 90-95% participation in any given month. Of the adult and teen population that has been tested, approximately 80% of the students have a diagnosed learning disability. Of 1,549 welfare recipients, another 76% received some form of on-the-job training.

Currently JOBS trainees that go onto college are not tracked, primarily because all Self-Initiate Training (S.I.T.'s) are tracked by the local agency of the Oregon State Department of Adult and Family Services. However, 358 adults and 24 teens obtained employment in the first half of the biennium. Recently, with the collaboration of some local food processing plants, an internship was developed that allows students extensive on-the-job-training and a wage of $6.50 an hour.

FUNDING

The total budget for 1993-95 biennium is $1,098,000.00. All contract dollars are kept separate from support service dollars. There are some federal matching dollars for support service expenditures. Some of the federal funding match comes by way of 20 hours or more participation, contracted child care, and Title XIX Mental Health expenditures. The "in-kind services" that BMCC provides are donated space, supplies, and combined training through its Adult Basic Education Department. Additional reporting and accounting services are provided by BMCC with a minimum indirect charge of 9%. BMCC has contributed additional classroom space and instructors to help carry out the JOBS program.

BARRIERS

Transportation is the number one barrier, resulting in clients in remote outlying areas not being able to access the three sites. Transportation is provided for a few by an inter-agency agreement with the local Head Start program.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The State of Oregon has repeatedly recognized this program for its number of job placements, overall teen parent participation and achievements, and very low administrative and program expenditures. Since the onset of JOBS, BMCC has continually exceeded all projections in each of the components, at an overwhelming decrease in cost to the taxpayer.

CHEMEKETA COMMUNITY COLLEGE (OR)

CONTACT: Daniel Boyd, Project Specialist, JOBS Coordination Unit, Building 19, 4000 Lancaster Drive NE, Salem, OR 97309-7070. [Telephone: (503) 399-5549]

TITLE OF PROGRAM: DISTRICT 3 JOBS PROGRAM

PURPOSE: The purpose of the JOBS Program at Chemeketa Community College (CCC) is to assist recipients of AFDC to become self-sufficient by providing needed employment-related activities and support services, consistent with CCC's mission "to empower through intellectual growth, meaningful career preparation and advancement, and enhanced personal effectiveness."

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* Total integration of JOBS services with all others offered by College

* Special focus on teen parents w/out a high school diploma in this rural area

* Coordination between the College and AFS is promoted through District 3 guidebook updated quarterly for JOBS professionals

SUMMARY

The District 3 JOBS program at CCC was started in October of 1989, serves the rural counties of Marion, Polk, and Yamill. Taken together, the total population (1993 estimates) was about 370,000, of whom about 48,000 were living below the poverty line. As of May 1994, there were 5,245 AFDC cases (one parent), with 13,908 persons tied to those cases, of whom 9,561 were children. There were 611 two-parent AFDC cases, with 2,471 persons tied to those cases, of whom 1,399 were children.

All participants are assessed for appropriateness to enter JOBS at their AFS branch office by workers knowledgeable about program activities and support services. All applicants for AFDC are referred to initial job search as are all recipients who may be considered as ready for JOBS participation. Those who do

not find a job in this seven week activity attend a two-hour JOBS orientation and take the BASIS Assessment, a vocationally oriented reading, writing, and math assessment test. The AFS branch office then works with the client to determine if the CCC JOBS Program is appropriate and, if so, which activity.

Figures are available that reflect the number of participants Chemeketa Community College expected to serve and actually served in all activities in the JOBS service district during the 1993-1994 fiscal year. These data reflect the level of participation of JOBS Program students in all of the College's activities, including developmental education (ABE/GED). The figures also reflect how many job placements are being achieved, including the average wage at placement.

The entire community benefits from the JOBS program model. The College and the JOBS Coordination Unit support coordination of basic education, counseling and mental health services, job readiness and life skills training, job skills training, and job search activities in partnership with AFS and other community agencies and organizations. In designing program delivery, CCC with the support of its community partners chose to mainstream services. The JOBS participants are integrated into CCC programs in all service/activity areas, and treated like regular CCC students. College officials believe mainstreaming services has the benefit of educating the community by breaking down the stereotype that JOBS participants/welfare recipients are somehow different from everyone else.

Oregon operates JOBS under additional federal waivers, including one that enables the college to serve adults whose youngest child is one year old or older. While teens and young adults comprise a primary target group, the waiver enables other parents to be served when they and their children are younger. Serving younger individuals helps to break the cycle of dependency, poverty, and abuse.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Teen parents without a high school diploma or GED are required to participate in the District 3 JOBS program. Federally mandated target groups guide the selection of the adult population. As of May, 1994 the program was serving 895 target group participants and 536 non-target participants in JOBS activities throughout the tri-county service district (Marion, Polk, and Yamhill counties). Another 138 clients were on hold status at that time.

Teen pregnancy continues to rise. Many of the teens in the community who become pregnant are from households with some history of AFDC involvement.

The majority are victims of some form of abuse, as are the majority of adult participants. Serving these clients while their children are young thus represents a major effort to break the cycle of dependency as well as poverty and abuse.

FUNDING

The total budget for the 1993-1995 biennium is about $7 million; of that CCC receives per its contract with Oregon AFS over $4 million. The remaining $3 million is utilized to provide support services such as child care and transportation; CCC does not track what portion of funds are from state or federal sources.

With its mainstreaming concept, CCC provides a range of "leveraged" in-kind services. Virtually every department at CCC is involved with JOBS participants on a regular or intermittent basis. The structure makes putting a dollar figure on in-kind/leveraged services difficult. The JOBS budget was established by focusing on the additional costs, not separate costs, that would be needed to serve the numbers of students JOBS would bring to CCC. These costs included additional support staff, instruction, space, materials, and direct administration. Any services and resources already existing and available to all students would be available to JOBS participants as well.

BARRIERS

Transportation, child care, and client readiness and willingness to participate have definitely been proven barriers to successful participation of JOBS at Chemeketa Community College. Increasing numbers of students are "difficult to serve" participants, possessing multiple and/or serious educational and social barriers to overcome. The college is focusing more and more on self-sufficiency planning with the AFDC recipients rather than old-model punitive methods of service involvement. Throughout the service district, the program partners are working to improve upon the management and disbursement practices of the support service dollars. The emphasis on the part of all partners in the service district on creativity, responsiveness, communication, and collaboration has taken the program to greater prominence, especially true in the last year-and-one-half.

Early on, communication difficulties around both service delivery to individual clients/students and program administration caused problems and some ill-will between partners. There were also growing pains. Philosophical differences between an educational institution and the AFDC agency were notable.

Extensive effort has gone into developing a better understanding of all partners institutions and development of mutually agreed upon objectives and outcomes for the program. Communication guidelines were enhanced and electronic mail and voice mail were improved into productive, useful tools. Now, administratively, the program is much more manageable, and there is much more ability to mutually meet the needs of common clients/students. This included dramatic improvement of tracking and monitoring systems.

In addition, a district guidebook was developed for the JOBS program, which has been placed into each JOBS practitioner's hands. It is updated by the JOBS Coordination Unit at the College quarterly, and includes activity schedules, short-term training updates, the Statement of Work for the service district, a general procedures manual, and rosters for all planning groups in the district.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

AFS produces a "Self-Sufficiency Newsline" monthly which highlights staff accomplishments, client achievement, and recognizes innovative program delivery methods. Service District 3 is featured in this publication regularly. Service District 3 has been recognized statewide for accomplishments, as well as its innovative mainstreaming model. Participants are proud to be a part of the overall effort here in Oregon with a JOBS program that is recognized nationally for its successes. Oregonians, after all, are known for that pioneering spirit!

CLEVELAND STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE (TN)

CONTACT: Mrs. Regina Turpin, Cleveland State Community College, P.O. Box 3570, Cleveland, TN 37320-3570 [Telephone: (615) 478-6240]

TITLE OF PROGRAM: JOBSWORK

PURPOSE: The JOBSWORK Program assures that needy families with children obtain the education, training, and employment that will help avoid long-term welfare dependence.

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* College already served as administrative entity for JTPA SDA #5; JOBSWORK built upon a history of cooperation and coordination.

* Integration and seamless entry of JOBS participants into College's programs

SUMMARY

The JOBSWORK program was implemented in Tennessee Service Delivery Area (SDA) #5, located in the southeastern corner of Tennessee, in October of 1989. Bradley, McMinn, and Meigs Counties are an area of ridges, hills, and valleys; most of Monroe and Polk Counties lie within the boundaries of Cherokee National Forest. The area totals 2,062 square miles, and the SDA's population is estimated at 174,260. Data provided by the Tennessee Department of Human Services (TDHS) reflected 2,203 AFDC recipients as of January 1992. Relative to educational status, the Tennessee Department of Employment Security estimated that 51.8 percent of adults age 22 and over were not high school graduates. Of the youth ages 16-21 who were not in school, 53.6 percent were not graduates.

Individuals may participate in Cleveland State Community College's JOBSWORK program by meeting one of the following four criteria: (1) Have received AFDC for any 36 of the last 60 months; (2) Are custodial parents under age 24 without a high school diploma or GED and are not currently enrolled at the College; (3) Are custodial parents under age 24 with little or no work history in the last 12 months; (4) Are in a family in which the youngest child is within 2 years of being ineligible for AFDC because of age.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In June, 1994, 104 JOBSWORK participants satisfactorily participated in a

JOBSWORK training component. Twenty-six (26) were enrolled in GED classes. Thirty (30) attended Cleveland State Community College. Two (2) attended another junior college. Nine (9) attended a vocational-technical school. The remaining participants were enrolled in job readiness or work activities. Of the total, only eleven (11) were males. Statistics obtained by Memphis State University for 1992/93 show that SDA 5 had a 47% employment rate at point of follow-up assessment, which occurred 13 weeks after termination from the JOBSWORK program (the estimated performance level was 44%, and the state-wide performance was 50%.) *Importantly, the average hourly wage in SDA 5 was $7.27 -- significantly higher than the state-wide average of $6.24.*

FUNDING

Funding for the JOBSWORK program is provided in part by the TDHS. Data from the College for the 1992 JOBS contract showed that CSCC spent $11,324.26 for administration; $44,669.56 for support services; $31,835.12 for training; for a total of $87;828.94. Information was not available regarding JTPA expenditures or indirect costs to CSCC. For the report month of June, 1994, $176,291.16 in child care dollars had been obligated since July 1, 1993.

BARRIERS

Transportation and child care are key barriers to employment. Participants receive mileage reimbursement payments and limited auto repairs through support services. Vendor payments are made directly to child care providers.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Several participants have been recognized for their accomplishments. The most recent was Kathy, who participated in a state-wide JOBSWORK conference as a panelist. She shared her personal story of encouragement from her GED instructor: Kathy passed her GED with the highest score in the entire SDA, and subsequently enrolled at CSCC. Her audience of about 600 state employees was brought to tears by her honest account of her past abuse, and her discovery of self-worth through joining a network of caring individuals. On the spot, she was offered a scholarship to continue her education, and is presently pursuing her Bachelor's Degree at the University of Tennessee at Martin.

COLORADO MOUNTAIN COLLEGE (CO)

CONTACT: Patricia Christensen, Colorado Mountain College, 1402 Blake Avenue, Glenwood Springs, CO 81601 [Telephone: (303) 945-2323].

TITLE OF PROGRAM: THE GATEWAY

PURPOSE: The Gateway Program provides comprehensvie services leading to self-sufficiency for all residents of Garfield County receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* Based on extractive industries, local economy has history of "boom and bust."
* Wealthy tourists from nearby Vail and Aspen are crowding out native people
* Tourist economy makes above minimum-wage jobs and housing difficult.

SUMMARY

Colorado Mountain College (CMC) became involved with JOBS upon passage of the Family Support Act of 1988. Negotiations began initially with the local Department of Social Services, and students began enrolling in classes in August of 1990. College administrators, starting at the top with the President, felt that serving AFDC recipients was clearly a part of the college's mission and felt that these students should be made to feel welcome at CMC. Initially, there was some dissension among some of the faculty, but this was very short-lived. The College has always served both traditional 18-22 year old as well as non-traditional students. Many faculty have commented on the wealth of experience these students bring to class. They also have proven to be very good students, and this fact helps to correct a very negative "welfare" stereotype within the community.

Located in western Colorado, this very rural county suffers from repeated "boom and bust" cycles. Mining, oil shale development, and agriculture--all extractive industries--have seen periods of upswing only to be followed by periods of decline. The only remaining "industry" is tourism. Garfield County is located 45 miles north of Aspen and 50 miles west of Vail. The county seat, Glenwood Springs, is a major tourist destination. Housing is almost non-existent, and commuting up to 60 miles to the College one-way is common. Jobs that pay above the minimum wage to provide self-sufficiency are difficult to find.

The Garfield County Department of Social Services (DSS) caseload numbers approximately 150 families per month receiving AFDC. The Gateway Program is a collaborative effort between the Garfield County DSS, the local JTPA Program, and the College to provide comprehensive resources, education, training, and job placement so these individuals, of whom 98% are single parent female heads of households, can become productive members of society.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Participation in the Gateway Program is required of all AFDC recipients in Garfield County. Unlike other Colorado JOBS programs, CMC does not "cream" participants. The entry point into Gateway is a one-day orientation in the month the recipient(s) applied for AFDC benefits. From this meeting, counselors refer students to one of five program components: (1) Community Work Experience Program, (2) On-the-Job Training, (3) Job Search, (4) Vocational Training, which is combined with GED preparation, and (5) a pre-vocational skills program.

Members of each cooperating agency work as a team to "case manage" the participants within the individual components. The team meets face-to-face monthly to address issues and resources program participants need. Numbers vary as the population in Garfield County fluctuates according to the cycles of its major industry, tourism. Current caseload is down due to the lack of affordable housing (an average home sells for $200,000; rent often exceeds $800 per month).

The post-secondary component of CMC's Gateway Program currently has 60 students enrolled. The pre-vocational program serves 30 students per year during three ten-week sessions. The five components of the Gateway program serve about 225 individuals each year. The components at CMC components (vocational and pre-vocational) serve about 100-125 individuals per year. Of the population served, 99% are females aged 18 to 45. Nearly all live below the poverty level ($280/month for a mother and one child, and $360/month for a mother and two children). Of those entering the Gateway Program, 50% do not possess a GED or high school diploma. Almost all (85%) enter into at least one developmental class (Basic English or Fundamentals of Math), before beginning a college-level program; many require an entire semester of developmental education.

Since Garfield County only allows 24 months for post-secondary education under its Gateway welfare reform plan, students often must push to take more credits than are appropriate for their educational level. The County requires 12

credits for the first semester, 15 for each succeeding semester, and 6-9 credits for the summer semester. A developmental semester, one in which 66% of the classes are developmental, can be exempted from the 24 month requirement. Work towards the GED also does not count toward the 24 month requirement. The educational institution is currently negotiating with the Colorado State DSS to lower the required credits per semester. Also, many of these students possess some learning disability. This may explain the students' unsuccessful attempts in school "the first time around." The Gateway Program is designed to build upon the College's proven success in dealing with underprepared learners. The College tests for learning disabilities when necessary. Many students relate that they lost interest in high school because they felt unable to learn. Subsequently, they became involved in a relationship leading to pregnancy and became single parents.

The College and the students have benefitted from the program. There are six to eight students graduating with certificates or AAS degrees each semester, including summer. Many other students leave AFDC to work after taking several courses; others ontinue with their degree programs at night after finding work. The retention rate for Gateway students at CMC who enroll in a full-time vocational program exceeds 50%, which is quite successful.

FUNDING

Each agency is funded independently. The Gateway Program at CMC receives no federal JOBS funds other than the reimbursement that which the Colorado DSS receives on a matching basis. The Garfield County DSS has one full-time case manager assigned to the Gateway Program; in addition, they employ a half-time case manager aide. Funding staff, case managers, and supervisors has been a major problem for the county.

The JPTA program puts in no special funds for this program. These students/clients are seen by the regular JPTA counselors. The College provides a 25 hour/week program director at a cost of $21,646 from operating funds. A half-time case manager/technical assistant is funded from a Perkins Vocational Funds Grant and paid $8,930 per year. In addition, because of the history of abuse shared by 90 percent of the students enrolled in the program, a grant was written to a private foundation to fund a part-time mental health counselor. This grant was for $14,500. The total cash budget of the program is $45,076. The College also provides office space for the above employees. The Gateway Program also

receives grants for supportive services for child care, emergency dental care, vision testing and eyeglasses, travel expenses, and tuition assistance from various private foundations and community service agencies, Rotary, and Lions Clubs. The total amount of these funds averages between $3,000 and $5,000 per year.

BARRIERS

The students served by the Gateway Program present many personal and mental health barriers. These barriers include past physical, sexual, substance, and emotional abuse, low educational attainment levels, poor self-esteem, and poor life-coping skills.

Child care and transportation are major issues. Child care facilities are very limited. Students living 30 to 40 miles away often have broken down cars, and the area has no public transportation. Another large problem is lack of medical and dental care. These students have traditionally ignored or not had access to good medical care. In addition, fewer than five physicians in entire county accept Medicaid patients. Medical benefits for dental care end at age 21, and many of the students have painful dental problems. The Gateway Program has raised some funds for emergency dental services, however this remains a major problem.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The three agencies involved in the Gateway Program received a $150,000 grant to develop a "model" program for rural Colorado in 1990. Colorado State Representative Scott McInnis has interviewed team members for his local cable access television show because it was a "model" program.

The Link pre-vocational program instituted a risking/rock climbing component. Numerous educational entities recognized this outstanding curriculum. The program director and outdoor education faculty member gave a presentation entitled "Climb On: From Welfare to a Degree" at the 1993 COMBASE National Conference on Strengthening Communities Through Customer-Focused Initiatives, held in Colorado Springs last fall. In addition, the director and faculty member gave the presentation to The League for Innovation in the Community College's Leadership 2000 conference in San Diego in the summer of 1994. Students in this program continually make Dean's and President's List for academic achievement. In addition, eight Gateway Program students were inducted into Phi Theta Kappa, the national honor society for community college students, in May of 1994.

HAYWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE (NC)

CONTACT: Judith Smith, Academic Development Chair, Haywood Community College, Freelander Drive, Clyde, NC 28721 [Telephone: (704) 627-4544]

TITLE OF PROGRAMS: JOBS/BASIC SKILLS & JOBS/ALTERNATIVES

PURPOSE: To educate JOBS clients, as part of the College's commitment as an open-access institution.

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* Rural economy produces few above minimum wage level jobs.

* A very small college serving 45,000 people in rural Appalachia.

SUMMARY

In 1992, the Haywood County Department of Social Services (DSS) was given the mandate and funds to provide a JOBS Program in Haywood County. LApproximately 400 welfare recipients were initially listed in the target population. Every other month participants are recruited by the DSS to attend a JOBS orientation. The half-day orientation familiarizes participants with the benefits of participation, and the consequences of non-participation in the JOBS Program. This session is conducted by the DSS social workers; however HCC staff attend and are given a chance to present educational opportunities. Participants are encouraged in every way possible to continue their educations. Both HCC and DSS staff feel that this is the best route for participants to get off the welfare rolls and onto taxpayers' rolls.

The first step in the educational process is enrolling participants into a JOBS Alternatives class for five weeks, 8:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., four days per week. This component covers self-esteem, attitude improvement, listening skills, resolving issues of change and conflict, goal setting, confidence building, educational opportunities, self presentation, motivation, and orientation to the worlds of education and work. During this class, students are assessed, and their level of study skills, academic needs, and job skills determined. Upon completion of this component, students choose to continue their education or to take a job. Those who choose education enter the JOBS Basic Skills Program or take the College

placement test to start a program within the regular HCC curriculum.

The JOBS Basic Skills classes are open ended. Students spend as much or as little time as is necessary in class preparing for the high school equivalency test (GED) or preparing to pass a life skills test required by North Carolina DSS. The JOBS Alternatives and JOBS Basic Skills classes are held open for JOBS participants, no matter how tight the availability of classes might be for other HCC students. Officials at HCC feel that by keeping the JOBS students together, they create a support network that fosters student success. Students who take the placement test and who fail to make the appropriate cut score enroll in developmental classes in English, math, algebra, and reading. In these classes, students must pass competency tests to exit; however, students may take these classes as many times as necessary until they achieve mastery.

Students who choose employment enter the JOBS/Alternatives class, which orients them to the world of work. Interviewing, filling out applications, and resume writing are covered, as are getting along with supervisors and co-workers. Students weak in study skills but who wish to enter HCC regular classes are enrolled in a class called "Making the Grade." *Making the Grade* emphasizes college-going skills, such as note-taking, test taking strategies, stress management, and task and time management. A learning disability specialist, the HCC day care center and the HCC job placement service may also be accessed.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Haywood Community College's JOBS/Basic Skills and JOBS/Alternatives Programs have been in operation since 1992. Social workers' case loads are limited; as a result, enrollment in JOBS is limited by the DSS. All JOBS clients are AFDC recipients. Most are females ages 20-28 and do not possess high school diplomas upon enrollment in the program. In the two years of the program, 55 students have obtained GEDs, 105 have entered the College, 19 have graduated from HCC, and 12 have obtained full-time employment. The program components and the numbers of students enrolled are: (1) Alternative Classes, 110; (2) Basic Skills, 100; (3) Developmental Classes, 85; (4) Curriculum Classes, 50; (4) Study Skills Classes, 50; and (5) Job Seeking and Keeping, 20.

FUNDING

All governmental funds for the JOBS Program are handled by the North

Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS). The College is not reimbursed by the JOBS Program for serving these students. Curriculum tuition, books, and child care are the only expenses charged by the College. All other classes and services provided by the College are free. Due to insufficient space on campus, the College staff uses a local church for some of the JOBS classes.

BARRIERS

The plan for providing services to JOBS participants was initiated and carried out by the personnel at HCC. The initial transition period was difficult for all parties concerned. Staffs of both agencies persisted and eventually knocked down barriers, and today the process functions well. Success at breaking barriers can be traced to constant, mandatory communication in the form of meetings to work out problems. Transportation, child care, and student recruitment are the main contributions made by DSS, while HCC assumes responsibilities for education.

There appears to be a gap between those services provided HCC and those provided by DSS. Many needs of dysfunctional families, substance abusers, and unskilled parents cannot be addressed by either partner. There is a continuing need for personal counseling of clients, which is also difficult to address. The JOBS Basic Skills Program is where participants will choose to drop out of the JOBS Program, if indeed they do. Some must spend inordinate amounts of time mastering basic skills. Assessments show many functioning at elementary levels, and many are being diagnosed for the first time with learning disabilities.

Employment of JOBS participants, educated or not, is a *monumental* problem because of the economy in Haywood County. Some participants need $11 an hour to equal what they receive in public assistance from AFDC, food stamps, housing subsidies, utilities, and Medicare. Pay for entry level employment in Haywood County is usually at or near the minimum wage.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The Department of Social Services received an award for having met their goals through the JOBS Program at HCC. Many students, while not receiving awards specifically through the JOBS Program, have become leaders in college clubs and organizations and have received numerous scholarships.

INDEPENDENCE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CONTACT: Ms. Peggy Reidle, Coordinator, Single Parent/Displaced Homemaker Program, Independence Community College, College Avenue and Brookside Drive. Independence, KS 67301 [Tel: 316/331-4420; fax: 316-331-5344]

TITLE OF PROGRAM: SINGLE PARENT/DISPLACED HOMEMAKER

PURPOSE: To provide counseling and coordination to enable students/clients to reach their educational goals and succeed in life

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* Strong emphasis on Adult Basic Education and GED attainment

* Through JOBS, access to existing ICC services extended and improved

SUMMARY

Independence Community College (ICC) is a small institution that serves about 1,500 students annually. The College has participated in a consortium of six community colleges in southeast Kansas to operate a Single Parent/Displaced Homemaker Program for over 16 years. ICC's program is one of the largest and most successful in this part of the state, beginning in 1978 as an affiliate of the institution's ABE Program. After 10 years in a downtown, off-campus location, the program was moved back to campus where it began to develop its own identity. In the beginning, it served approximately 20 people yearly. Life skills, job search skills, and resume writing were the career skills covered. Much has changed since 1978. An adult support group, AWARE, was established to give nontraditional adult students returning to college their own organization on campus. Today, it is a very active group meeting on a weekly basis. The organization provides both individual and group support, fund-raising activities, and features guest speakers providing specialized training opportunities at no charge.

In 1991, Kansas introduced KANWORK, a comprehensive JOBS Program for public assistance recipients in Southeast Kansas. Peggy Riedle, the newly appointed Single Parent Coordinator, was asked by the Dean of Student Services, Charles Smart, to be ICC's contact person and program coordinator with KANWORK. Utilizing a strong background in ABE, basic skills training, assessment and tutor training, the coordinator worked to hook KANWORK directly into the network of existing student support services at ICC.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The result of this coordinated effort has been a 50 percent growth in GED graduates and 11 percent growth of the JOBS recipients transitioning from ABE

to degree-seeking vocational and academic programs. The program has experienced tremendous growth in the past five years, from 20 students to serving more than 200 women and men. New skills and services have also been added to meet the changing needs of today's transitional adults. They include: career interest advisement, academic counseling, monetary assistance with tuition, books and child care, and community-wide van transportation for adults lacking there own vehicle. The programs coordinator is located in the Student Union, close to counseling and enrollment to provide easy access for adults needing counseling or class assistance, child care referrals, and arrangements for van transportation. The coordinator is a full-time professional who provides all of the services in the program, including facilitating AWARE, and supervising the institution's van service. The coordinator is also a member of the College President's Administrative Council and serves on a college self-directed team to identify and refer students to child care programs demonstrating high standards of excellence.

FUNDING

The College contributes in-kind services. KANWORK provides support through child care and transportation assistance.

BARRIERS

Initially, staff at KANWORK and ICC knew little about each other's programs and services. A referral system was jointly established to include the ABE and developmental educational programs. Whether students begin with ABE or enter ICC directly, their activities are coordinated at all levels, including child care and transportation. The success of this program is a result of effective, high level communication between the ICC coordinator and KANWORK case workers. Both parties fully understand each other's job and work within the parameters of those positions. There is also an understanding that the client/student's welfare and his or her personal goals are the highest priority. When a student has any difficulty with a class, the coordinator and KANWORK caseworker get involved and coordinate their activities with the student and instructor until the situation is handled. Joint meetings are regularly held to provide updates on each student's progress. The key to its success can be summarized in three words: Dedication, Compassion, and Teamwork.

JEFFERSON COLLEGE (MO)

CONTACT: Jane Kost, Dean, Extended and Non-Traditional Learning, Jefferson College, 1000 Viking Drive, Hillsboro, MO 63050
[Telephone: 314/789-3951, ext.140; Fax: 314/789-4012]

TITLE OF PROGRAM: JOBS FUTURES

PURPOSE: Working with the Division of Family Services (DFS) to provide regular college credit programming to DFS JOBS participants and to provide a strong support system to ensure their success.

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* A traditional rural economy transitioning to a suburban economy

SUMMARY

The targeted population for the JOBS Futures Program is selected by the DFS case managers. They determine the needs of applicants and then refer them to Jefferson College (JC). Assessment services are provided to determine the participants' interests and needs. Preparation for the GED is provided to those needing the service, as are developmental courses for those needing to update basic reading, math, and language skills prior to attempting college credit courses.

Jefferson County is a county of contrasts. With a projected population of 201,880 people by the year 2000, the county is attempting to plan for its transition from a rural to a suburban economy. To the west and south, virgin forests provide camping, hiking, fishing and hunting. To the north are the cultural and recreational amenities of the St. Louis metropolitan area, the 14th largest region in the country, just an hour away. A low average cost of living is an important factor in the growth of the County and in the quality of life available. The growth of managerial professional specialty occupations, which compose 16.8 percent of the workforce, further documents the transition to a suburban economy. Still, the County is one of the poorest of the 114 in Missouri; almost 8% of the population lives below the poverty level. The county's arson rates, rates of participation in AFDC assistance, and child abuse/neglect referrals surpass much larger counties.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Jefferson College has benefitted from its JOBS Futures enrollments. The enrollments provide the college with the opportunity to serve members of the community most in need of such services. Participants have benefitted from enrollment in Jefferson College--gaining skills which help them to secure employment and break the assistance cycle. Participants enrolled in the Skill

Training Program receive in-depth case management from counselors who are available daily -- these participants are generally those who have not been successful in the past and appear to need strong support services.

Tracking characteristics of the population served is performed for all JUC students, of which JOBS Futures enrollees are a part. Because JOBS Futures participants are part of the Jefferson College (JC) student body, separate statistics are not collected on JOBS Futures participants on a regular basis. However, according to the First Quarter, 1994 Summary of JOBS Futures Program Activity prepared by the area Private Industry Council, 26 JOBS students received assessment services at JC; 37 received Vocational/Technical skills training; and 14 received GED preparation services.

FUNDING

There is no direct cost to Jefferson College for the JOBS Futures program. The College works closely with DFS case managers to use existing services available for county residents. In most cases, JTPA funds are used to provide services for the economically and educationally disadvantaged. Pell Grants are available to assist participants with other costs associated with the time they are in training. The College provides administrative support and space for JOBS Futures activities at no charge, as part of its mission to the community it serves.

BARRIERS

Transportation continues to be a key barrier in Jefferson County because no public transportation exists. Participants must have their own transportation to access services and to secure employment after training. In general, few barriers exist to JOBS Futures participants needing child care services. The JC Day Care Center provides child care for participants enrolled in classes and has worked out a billing system with the state so that participants are not inconvenienced.

Interagency cooperation is the reason why success has been experienced in the Jefferson County service delivery area. Jefferson College, the Division of Family Services, Employment Security, and the Office of Job Training Programs, Inc. meet on a monthly basis to discuss available services and progress to date.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Service Delivery Area (SDA) 15 (Jefferson & Franklin counties) has received Governor's Awards as the #1 SDA in Missouri in meeting or exceeding performance standards and Outstanding Skills Training Program for the past four years. All agencies involved have put the best interest of the participant ahead of turf issues, which is why the programs are so successful. An example of what can be accomplished by JOBS Futures clients is the attached nomination of Walter Chapman for JTPA Student of the Year, described in detail below. Again, because of close collaboration and elimination of "turf" problems between JTPA and JOBS, our JOBS Futures staff takes as much pride in Mr. Chapman's accomplishments as it would had he been enrolled direclty in the JOBS Futures program itself.

JEFFERSON COLLEGE JTPA ALUMNI OF THE YEAR

We would like to nominate Walter Chapman, who completed the Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning program in the Spring of 1994, as the JTPA student of the year from our area. Walter meets all the requirements needed to be nominated.

After years of employment as a bricklayer, Walter, like so many others, became the victim of a shaky economy. He searched unsuccessfully for over a year to secure employment that would support his family. Finally, they wound up on welfare and food stamps. Walter was called in May 1993 as a mandatory participant in the Futures program. This is when his life began to change in a positive direction.

From the beginning, Walter participated in all the requirements of the Futures program as if he were a volunteer. He immediately started working toward his GED, attending class for four hours each day. The Futures case manager, ABE teachers, and staff were all favorably impressed by his hard-working attitude and cheerful disposition.

While Walter was still studying for his GED, he enrolled in the JTPA program for Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning (HRAC). All of our HRAC students were required to carry an extra heavy course load in order to obtain the two-year program certificate in one year. From August until October, he was attending GED classes for 4 hours per day while carrying a 20 credit hour per semester course load in skill training. After passing his equivalency test, Walter continued to put in long hours. In addition to his difficult skill training schedule, he fulfilled his requirement for the Futures program by volunteering in the ABE department at Jefferson College for 22 hours each week.

In the ABE classroom, he was required to work on computers entering student demographic data. This, too, presented a new challenge for Walter since he had never worked with computers before. During his volunteer work in the ABE department he wore many hats. He assisted GED students when they appeared to be struggling. Walter also helped by opening the classroom. This consisted of uncovering computers, checking in and out both books and disks, preparing classroom materials, and making all students feel welcome as they arrived each morning. The ABE teachers and staff described Walter as being a very prompt, reliable worker, who, when asked, would do anything he could to help both students and teachers. They said that overall he was a fantastic co-worker who will be a class act to follow. While putting in his long hours, Walter was able to maintain 100% attendance and a grade point average of 3.875. He graduated in May 1994 with honors, receiving his certificate in Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning.

Walter is now happily employed at Cedar Run Apartments, a 350 unit complex, in south St. Louis County. He enjoys the challenge of his work because each day presents a new challenge. Walter stated that the skills he learned in class give him the confidence to do the job well. He recognizes the benefit of the JTPA programs, stating, "Thanks to the JTPA program I was able to return to school and receive my certificate in Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning. They were very helpful in making me build confidence in myself. They also helped me in my job search with resumes and cover letters. My deepest heart felt thanks to all the women in the JTPA office for all their help and support."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JOHN TYLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE (VA)

CONTACT: Ms. Bettyanne F. Harrison, Coordinator, JOBS Program, John Tyler Community College, Chester, VA 23831 [Telephone: 804/796-3409]

TITLE OF PROGRAM: JTCC JOBS PROGRAM

PURPOSE: The JTCC JOBS Program is a joint venture between the JTCC and the Departments of Social Service (DSS) of five of the counties JTCC serves. The JTCC JOBS Program provides education support for students recommended by DSS to improve their career opportunities.

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* A College that serves three small cities, suburbs, and rural areas; five of the seven county DSS agencies partner with JTCC's JOBS Program

* Child care, transportation, and inability of federal Title IV student aid to accomodate the needs of JOBS students present continuing barriers

SUMMARY

1 In the fall of 1990, representatives of JTCC and area DSS offices generated the first JOBS grant proposal, set program parameters, and selected the first Coordinator. Students entered the JOBS Program in January, 1991. The JTCC JOBS Program targets single parent women receiving public assistance including AFDC, Food Stamps, Medicaid, and housing subsidies. Students vary in age from their early twenties to mid-forties, attending College to enhance education and career choices, and enroll in academic curricula working toward associate degrees or certificates. In many ways, they are typical of JTCC's student body at large.

Educational support for JOBS students includes assessment of new students, developmental English and mathematics courses, counseling, advising in financial aid eligibility, classes in student development and career decision making, parenting skills, personal growth, and assessing student progress. The Program Coordinator facilitates communication and support between student services, faculty, and administration at JTCC and the DSS office of each locality, to create a supportive academic environment for special needs students.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The program has served over 200 students with a maximum number of 65 in

any single semester. Fifteen of the students have graduated from JTCC, and nine more are scheduled to graduate by Spring, 1995. Six students have transferred to four-year institutions, with two additional students scheduled to transfer this year. Many became ineligible once they left the welfare rolls, but remained in school to work on their educations.

FUNDING

Through an annually renewable contract, each locality agrees to pay a share of the cost of the JTCC JOBS program based on the number of students they wish to sponsor. The College provides services and administers the program. The cooperative relationship between area DSS offices and JTCC has proven to be cost effective to both parties, and has enabled the JOBS Coordinator to use the resources of both to assist students to achieve their educational and career goals.

BARRIERS

Barriers to student success in the JOBS Program include ineligibility for financial aid, transportation, and limitations on day care funding. Students who lose financial aid eligibility cannot continue classes since the localities are not funded to pay the full cost of tuition. Problems in each area are interrelated: Withdrawals or poor grades because of problems with transportation or day care can result in the loss of satisfactory academic progress for financial aid, and can thus cause students to drop out. Policy makers should give consideration to these problems when designing programs to serve this particular population.

Students who do not have personal transportation are denied access by default. The College is not serviced by any type of public transportation. Possibly the greatest problem occurs when students begin their education with adequate transportation, and have car problems forcing them to withdraw due to absences.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

In 1993 the JOBS Program received a Certificate of Recognition from the Tenth Annual Excellence in Education Conference acknowledging its quality and significant contribution to education in Virginia.

LINN-BENTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE (OR)

CONTACT: Pete Bober, Director, or Kimberly Freeman, Assistant Director, Life and Employment Department, Linn-Benton Community College, 6500 SW Pacific Boulevard, Albany, OR 97321 [Telephone: 503/967-0581, ext. 565]

TITLE OF PROGRAM: JOBS PROGRAM

PURPOSE: The Mission of the Linn-Benton Community College (LBCC) JOBS Program is to empower individuals and families to attain self-sufficiency by providing superior workforce development and educational opportunities.

KEY DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM FACTORS:

* Dramatic shift from to a technology based economy has displaced workers

* Child care, transportation, and inability of federal Title IV student aid to accomodate the needs of JOBS students present continuing barriers

SUMMARY

The LBCC JOBS Program began in October of 1990. The current contract dates are from July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1995. The targeted population for the LBCC JOBS Program is reflective of the diversity of the region's population. The regional office of the Oregon State Department of Adult and Family Services selects participants from existing caseloads who attend an orientation session. An in-depth assessment is performed, after which students are directed to different components of the JOBS Program. Depending on the particular barriers the prospective student has, the student may not enter JOBS at that time.

Linn, Benton and Lincoln Counties have a diverse population base spread over a large geographic area. High tech firms including Hewlett-Packard and Supra exist alongside logging firms such as Willamette Industries and Georgia Pacific, the tourist and fishing industries along the Oregon coast, farms, and numerous small businesses. Within a short drive is the state's land-grant university. The economy of the region continues to shift. In particular, the demand for highly skilled workers in the changing regional economy is growing. For this reason, it is imperative to provide JOBS Program participants with an individualized plan to help prepare them for full-time, unsubsidized employment. Therefore, the LBCC JOBS Program includes life and career planning, adult basic education, short-term, professional technical training, worksite training, and job-search instruction

connecting participants to the growing sectors of the local economy.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

From July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994, 1,268 students entered the LBCC JOBS Program. The average age of participating students was 30, and about one-sixth, or approximately 220, were teens. Seventy-six percent were women, and 24% were men. Ninety-six percent were white, two percent Hispanic, one percent African-American, and one percent Native American. The students self-reported their highest grade completed, which averaged the 11th grade. During the same time period, 349 attended basic skills classes working toward a GED, and 37 finished their high school diplomas. All were welfare recipients. Of the 1,268 students served in the JOBS Program, 181 students, or about 14.3%, attended college courses on either a part-time or full-time basis during the period July 1, 1993-June 30, 1994. In the same period, 395 students or 31% gained employment.

FUNDING

The budget for the Linn-Benton Community College JOBS Program from July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994 was $1,309,286. Of the $1.3 million, 59% were state funds, and 41% from federal sources. The normal rate of federally negotiated indirect costs for contract and grant activity is 49 percent, which, if charged to this grant, would equate to an indirect charge for the JOBS Program of $426,000. Considerably less per year is charged by LBCC in indirect costs, Numerous other services are provided in-kind at no cost to the program[12]. Finally, an ambitious leveraging process has allowed LBCC to develop a financial package which allowed its JOBS Program to be relocated to a brand new campus building in summer of 1992.

BARRIERS

---

[12] Above the indirect charge are charges for administrative-related activities, portions of the Director's, the Administrative Assistant's, and the Clerical Specialist's time, as well as all of a .75 Data Specialist's time. The LBCC JOBS Program provides a high level of service for the indirect charges received. Fiscal services provided by LBCC to the JOBS Program, which include such items as accounting, payroll, purchasing, contracting, and auditing activities. Human resource management services include advertising, recruitment, applicant screening, interview assistance, Equal Employment Opportunity compliance, salary placement, collective bargaining representation, and technical assistance. Other personnel services are provided as needed. The JOBS Program also receives a high level of in-kind management, program administration, and curriculum and student related problem-solving assistance from various educational and student service divisions of the College. The JOBS Program receives assistance from various campus support centers including Computer Services, Media Services, and the Community Relations Office. The College also provides the JOBS Program with meeting and activity space on campus and use of LBCC's district-wide courier service.

True collaboration is often difficult to achieve. "Bad blood" can exist between community colleges and local community-based organizations (CBOs), which can result in miscommunication and a sense that the College is "out to steal" another's program. An example of this is the tension, which exists between local JTPA-funded Private Industry Councils and community colleges in Oregon. Different philosophies also can drive tensions higher as one organization perceives that they can better provide certain services than the College. When CBOs serve as subcontractors for this program--JTPA provides the job search component, and the LBCC Employment Department provides job placement--conflicting management styles can be present. This is particularly true if the partners are stationed at the LBCC College facility, which works much better for the students, but may not allow the individual agencies to exert an acceptable level of direct control. In these times of tightened budgets, many territorial issues need resolution, and collaboration is a goal that has to be worked toward constantly.

Administrative issues arise when the College is the prime contractor. The smallest details must be paid attention to, such as how a grant-funded program like JOBS is to be billed for items which are typically funded through the College's General Fund[13]. Other campus programs may be taxed in many of the same ways administration is. Because the program is housed at a rural campus, open rooms, parking, and use of child care facilities become issues. The general student body may not understand why there isn't room on campus to park, or why space isn't available, and complaints and frustrations abound. Being aligned with a "welfare" program may not be always be a public relations asset in the community at large. When community colleges are the prime contractors of JOBS Programs, the expense may create additional animosity towards the JOBS Program participants. The community may view this as another overly expensive government program, and may resent having a program for the "poor" being housed on a campus where everyone else attending has to "pay" for education -- except JOBS students.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Staff of the LBCC JOBS Program have been invited to present at several local and national meetings and seminars that relate to successful work with individuals and families. Many LBCC JOBS Program students have gone on to receive awards, scholarships, and invitations to join educational organizations because of their academic achievements while pursuing post-secondary degrees. This record of success is one of which LBCC is justifiably proud.

---

[13] Billing for items like mileage, postage, telephones, and space rental must be administered and accounted for in dual systems, which adds additional tasks to the work loads to existing staff. If, for example, a JOBS Program provides computers for their staff, all general upkeep and on-going technical support may well end up being handled by current College staff, which can put tremendous burdens on already overworked departments. There are many hidden costs that can accompany the prime contract for JOBS. Start-up costs can be grossly underestimated if not carefully scrutinized for the indirect costs the College will incur. Maintenance costs increases, and costs related to support services that the college provides for individual departments, must be accommodated.

NORTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA A&M COLLEGE (OK)

CONTACT: DR. SUE STIDHAM, JOBS PROGRAM DIRECTOR
NORTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA A&M COLLEGE
200 "I" STREET, N.E.
MIAMI, OKLAHOMA 74354-0001
(918) 542-8441 EXT. 326

TITLE OF PROGRAM: OLDER, WISER, LEARNING STUDENTS (OWLS)

PURPOSE

STRENGTHENING SERVICES FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT (ET&E) PARTICIPANTS WHO ARE ENROLLED AS FULL-TIME STUDENTS AT NEO A&M COLLEGE AND FOR ET&E PARTICIPANTS WHO NEED BASIC SKILLS TRAINING AND EMPLOYABILITY TRAINING.

SERVICE AREA

Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College's (NEO) targeted population is comprised of Employment, Training, and Education (ET&E) participants from Ottawa, Delaware, Craig, Mayes, and Nowata counties. The selection process is a direct referral from the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (DHS) at the various sites. These participants all are on public assistance, which is reflective of the high poverty rate in NEO's surrounding counties, and the high rate of permanently displaced workers. The targeted population is then broken into four primary groups: Clients who are under 21 with no high school diploma or GED; clients under 24 with limited work experience and either a GED or high school diploma; clients who have been on welfare for 24 out of the previous 36 months; and "other", which includes those recipients who are referred by DHS that do not fit into any of these stated categories.

THE PROGRAM

Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College's funded JOBS Program is designed to meet the educational needs of ET&E participants and to enable them to find secure employment. A partnership was developed in 1992 with five counties in northeastern Oklahoma. The NEO OWLS Program (Older, Wiser Learning Students, or OWLS) was designed so that participants could overcome

expectations of failure, build success by building self-esteem, and reverse the trends that were harming them and their families. The NEO OWLS Program is committed to the total empowerment of ET&E participants and was designed to holistically serve their needs. The participants are integrated into the college setting with a total support system. NEO A&M College actively works to recruit these participants and then to help them maintain a strong sense of community. It also works to maintain a public/private partnership, and it works to strengthen the participants' interpersonal and social skills for the purpose of employability. The students have been strongly encouraged to select careers that have high marketability and that have the potential to lead to self-sufficiency.

The NEO OWLS Program serves 100 full-time students each semester. In its design, there are two additional modules which serve an additional 100 participants in a variety of ways, including basic skills and employability training. Approximately 50 participants will be enrolled in summer school each academic year.

The ages of the participants range from 21 to 35 and over. About 96% of the participants are female, and 4% are male. Of the participants, 64% have a parent or parents who graduated from high school, while 36% are first generation high school graduates. The statistical breakdown for the last grade completed in high school is 67% graduated; 6% completed the 8th grade; 18% completed the 9th grade; 5% completed the 10th grade; and 4% completed the 11th grade. The selected majors at NEO are primarily health science and business related programs. To date, all of NEO's trainees have been a part of either pre-collegiate or collegiate course work and usually a combination of the two. NEO strongly encourages placement in high marketability careers which will lead to self-sufficiency. To date, 23 OWLS students have been employed.

Participants in the OWLS Program have a high educational need for developmental education. The primary reason is that approximately 40% of the participants are high school dropouts, which means they are almost always automatically deficient in core areas. For the 60% who graduated from high school, past graduation requirements often did not meet college entrance level requirements in mathematics, English, reading, etc. Consequently, the participants often find themselves in a defic iency status. Nearly all of the participants have been out of the educational course taking for a number of years,

which is reflected in various standardized test data. Often, entering OWLS students will have a score of 14 or below on the ACT composite.

The NEO OWLS Program staff believe that all participants have benefitted in a varying degree from our program. The following data support this assertion:

- 52 OWLS students have graduated with Associate in Arts Degrees or Associate in Applied Science Degrees.
- 18 OWLS students were enrolled in other degree programs, including Registered Nursing and Medical Lab Technician, etc.
- 5 OWLS students have earned certificates such as MLT, Surgical Lab Tech, etc.
- 3 OWLS students received high school diplomas from the State of Oklahoma after having completed 30 hours of college credit.
- 7 OWLS students received scholarships from local professional women organizations and other scholarship programs.
- 2 OWLS students have received the outstanding award in their division upon graduation.
- 23 OWLS students are now employed.

FUNDING

Although the NEO JOBS Program officially was funded by the DHS in January 1992, philosophically the program began in 1989. The program began at NEO's Office of Continuing Education as an extended effort to serve the needs of area communities by recruiting permanently displaced workers. The program gained a reputation for success and was recruited as one of the four programs in the pilot program funding. In the spring of 1992, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the Oklahoma State Department of Human Services, which oversees JOBS in Oklahoma, signed an interagency agreement. This agreement has facilitated expanded program enhancement at community colleges in Oklahoma. If program funding is continued, the OWLS program will be continued or perhaps even expanded. Should NEO's JOBS funding end, OWLS will be integrated into NEO's existing programs, and the level of services reduced.

The projected budget for the 94-95 academic year is $323,596. The level of

commitment by JOBS is 70.39% or $227,779, and the institutional commitment is 29.61% or $95,817. NEO's contributions include facilities, equipment, personnel, and indirect costs. The cost to the institution far exceeds the stated costs, yet the College remains committed to serving ET&E participants as they work to break the stereotypes by gaining secure employment and break the cycle of dependency.

BARRIERS

Many key barriers have been overcome already in the development of the OWLS Program at NEO A&M College. Unfortunately, transportation in our rural area continues to pose a major barrier for many participants. Although participants are strongly advised against incurring student loan indebtedness, a large number still apply for and receive federal Stafford (Guaranteed Student) Loans which may result in their defaulting, should a variety of variables occur. The loans are primarily used to purchase used vehicles which temporarily eliminates this major barrier -- the lack of transportation. This short-term fix can and sometimes does become a long-term problem.

Child care has not been a problem for this program. Our model program has been designed with commitment from NEO to the participants and to the agencies they represent. Its development also required a positive attitude from agency representatives, participants, and NEO personnel. Finally, a willingness to listen, negotiate, and cooperate have been important. Administrative barriers at NEO have been overcome by committed leaders who have supported each positive change.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Success is hard to measure and document, because many there are many highly intangible factors contributing to it; however, the following present an example of the kind of success that the NEO OWLS JOBS Program has achieved:.

- Personal visits to the campus by officials from over 30 governmental entities and educational institutions for the purpose of program replication.
- Interviewed by The New York Times.
- Interviewed by the Oprah Winfrey Show as a possible feature.
- Featured on several television stations on different occasions.

Achievements by NEO OWLS program students in campus activities include:

- one student who served as the homecoming queen candidate;
- another ran and won the Student Body Government officer election;
- several serve on the college leadership council;
- several have been inducted into Phi Theta Kappa (honorary scholarship fraternity) and made the Dean's and President's Honor Rolls;
- several served on the college student discipline committee and a variety of other institutional committees.

Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College is proud of the achievements of its OWLS students, and is appreciative of the opportunity to work with the Oklahoma Department of Human Services to use JOBS to help the transition from welfare to work.

PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE (VA)

CONTACT: JOAN V. POWERS
PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RT. 6, BOX 1
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902
804-977-5627

TITLE OF PROGRAM: JOBSIGHT

PURPOSE

PIEDMONT VIRGINIA'S JOBS PROGRAM IS PART OF JOBSIGHT, A PROJECT DEDICATED TO THE ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY OF SINGLE PARENTS, DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS, AND LOW-INCOME ADULTS THROUGH EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

SERVICE AREA

The nearby presence of a major research institution such as the University of Virginia (UVA) influences the local labor market and the community in two important ways. First, UVA and the University Hospitals are by far the area's largest employers. This sets the stage for skilled, highly technical, service-oriented jobs. Second, the University attracts a well-educated, transitory population that is willing to accept temporary employment for which they are over-qualified. Newcomers to the community are often appalled to find that the pay for many jobs is low and the competition keen.

The effects on the local population are predictable. Those without high school educations can hardly compete in the local job market. High school graduates find themselves competing with college graduates for the same jobs. In order to find jobs that will allow them to be economically self-sufficient, adults turn to the community college for remedial education and skills.

THE COLLEGE

The Division of Continuing Education at Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) has as part of its mission to extend the opportunities of the community college to populations that might not ordinarily attend. The College's JOBSIGHT Program adds to that mission by providing the supportive services and financial aid needed by adults with multiple barriers to attend PVCC and to succeed in life.

An example of the way that JOBSIGHT has helped PVCC students in general is that the JOBS counselor has identified a need for learning disability testing on campus. Consequently, project staff have begun a cooperative project with the University of Virginia, which will eventually make testing available to all students at PVCC at either no cost or at a much reduced cost. This clearly shows that the benefits of collaboration are significant and can be long-lasting.

THE PROGRAM

The regional Office of the Virginia Department of Social Services works with all of the JOBS participants from six local social service departments, which refer individuals to PVCC's JOBSIGHT Program for education and training. Five counties and one city participate. The JOBS workers in each locality make the initial determination as to whether the college is the appropriate resource for the participant. The PVCC JOBSIGHT JOBS counselor works with each participant individually to provide career counseling and academic advising. The counselor also helps to determine and arrange all necessary supportive services at the college and in the community.

The area labor market demands a fairly high level of skills in jobs that pay well enough to allow self-sufficiency. The community college is the only source of training and education that is affordable, high quality, and universally accessible. The JOBS workers in the area try to use PVCC whenever possible or appropriate for their clients. The higher level skills training is sometimes seen as the only hope for the participant to break away from the public assistance system.

Learning disability testing was not part of the first year program although it

will be started in the second year. Nevertheless, there was a strong yet undocumented suspicion by all members of the Management Team that 40% to 70% of the participants did struggle with some form of a learning disability.

TABLE ONE

CHARACTERISTICS OF 1993-94 JOBSIGHT PARTICIPANTS
RECEIVING CASH WELFARE PAYMENTS
AT THE TIME OF ENROLLMENT

TOTAL Number of Participants: *58*

		No.	%
AGE:	Under 25	10	17.2%
	25-34	32	55.2%
	35-44	14	24.1%
	Over 45	2	3.4%
SEX:	Female	56	97.0%
	Male	2	3.0%
MARITAL STATUS:			
	Single	32	55.2%
	Separated/Divorced	20	34.5%
	Married	5	8.6%
	Widowed	1	1.7%
HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED:			
	G.E.D.	21	36.2%
	High School Diploma	5	60.4%
	Vocational Certification	2	3.4%
PLACED into Developmental Education Classes:		25	43.0%

Currently, mandatory and some voluntary JOBS participants with high school diplomas, or who have obtained GEDs, are being referred to the PVCC program. All 58 participants of this program were in a regular college curriculum.

TABLE TWO

OUTCOMES FOR THE FIRST YEAR OF JOBSIGHT

Graduated		6
Found Employment/off welfare	8	
Will continue in program at PVCC	33	
Will continue on own at PVCC	4	
Transferred to other training	2	
Dropped out	5	
Moved		1
TOTAL Number of Participants:	*58*	

FUNDING

The JOBSIGHT Program was created in 1985 with funding from Carl Perkins single parent and sex equity set asides and support from JTPA Title II-A. The JOBS program began two years ago as a pilot with funding from Albemarle County Department of Social Services. It was expanded in July 1993 to include the City of Charlottesville and the Counties of Louisa, Nelson, Fluvanna, and Greene. In-kind contributions from PVCC included office space, telephone, computer, office supplies, fiscal oversight, and supervision. It is expected that the program will continue indefinitely unless Governor Allen's welfare reform program, which emphasizes work-fare over education and training, has a negative impact on program funding.

TABLE THREE
FUNDING SOURCES FOR THE SALARY
OF THE JOBSIGHT COUNSELOR, 1994-1995

Federal pass through funds:	$2,425	
State/Local JOBS funds:		9,075
JTPA Title II-A funds:	3,000	
PVCC contribution:	4,500	

BARRIERS

This program overcame many barriers that might have been a hindrance to communication and coordination. A Management Team was established, which included the JOBS workers from each locality, the JOBSIGHT counselor, the JOBSIGHT Director, and the PVCC Learning Center Supervisor. This group met every other month to monitor contract performance, compliance with the JOBS program requirements, and services provided to the participants. The meetings were used to share information about and coordinate the services for the six local county Social Service Departments, PVCC, and JOBSIGHT, and to brainstorm solutions to the participants' problems.

The program also allowed Management Team members to divide up duties and to communicate about available financial aid resources. The JOBS workers did the intake and the initial educational plan. The JOBSIGHT counselor did the educational and career assessment and subsequent case management. Together, they worked out a delivery plan for financial aid for tuition, books, child care, and transportation using Pell grants, JOBSIGHT assistance (JTPA and Gender Equity funds), and JOBS assistance. There was a commitment on the part of agency directors and workers to make this program a success, so no problems surfaced that were insurmountable.

VOICES FROM THE FIELD:

SUBURBAN

COMMUNITY

COLLEGES

COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY (IL)

CONTACT: VICKIE GOODE
19351 W. WASHINGTON STREET
GRAYSLAKE, IL 60030
(708) 223-6601, Ext. 2916

TITLE OF PROGRAM:

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

PURPOSE

THE PROGRAM PROVIDES SHORT-TERM VOCATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL TRAINING TO ASSIST PUBLIC AID RECIPIENTS IN COMPETING EFFECTIVELY IN TODAY'S JOB MARKET.

SERVICE AREA

Lake County is one of the six counties in Illinois within the Chicago metropolitan area. Within Lake County, the major needs of public aid clients include accessing Adult Basic Education, GED Preparation, and vocational education/training; setting both short- and long-term education and employability goals. Major needs also include addressing child care and transportation issues, as well as participating in inter-agency programming leading toward self-sufficiency.

The College's Public Assistance program assists in all of these areas by providing direct service and information and referrals to community resources. The College of Lake County is committed to this program, as stated in its mission, by offering career-oriented curricula that provide the opportunity for immediate employment in semi-professional or skilled technical fields, or transfer for further professional training. The College is further committed through programs that provide adult education courses including courses in preparation for the high

school equivalency examination (GED), English as a Second Language (ESL), adult basic education (ABE), and prevocational training.

In general, the Public Assistance program benefits students by participating in an inter-agency collaboration that serves the dual purpose of equipping students with the education and training necessary for self-sufficiency, and by providing students with both direct and indirect support services as they work through the program.

Within the general public aid population in Lake County, the majority receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Other groups served include individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and General Assistance (GA). These targeted populations have been selected based on the parameters of the funding source. According to the Illinois Department of Public Aid (IDPA), the number of AFDC clients in Lake County is 3,545. Numbers of other groups in Lake County eligible for the program include 87 GA clients. Approximately 3,500 are SSI recipients. Table 1, "Characteristics of AFDC Clients in Lake County, Illinois," below, provides demographic data on these students.

The success of this program hinges on an inter-agency collaborative approach comprised of the College of Lake County (CLC) Public Assistance Program, IDPA Project Chance (IDPA-PC), and the Lake County Health Department Vocational Services (LCHD-VS). All three agencies work jointly through the recruitment, testing, and registration process. Individuals are issued the TABE (Test of Adult Basic Education), the CAPS (Career Ability Placement Survey) and a career interest inventory. During the registration process, students receive an orientation by Project Chance staff. At this orientation, Project Chance staff work with students to begin the process of support service payments for day care and reimbursement for transportation. Students meet with a college advisor who assists them in setting both short- and long-term education/employability goals and in enrolling individuals in an appropriate education/training program. Individuals are then placed in ABE, GED, ESL, or vocational training.

This inter-agency collaboration continues as individuals progress through each semester. Project Chance provides support services and case management;

TABLE ONE
CHARACTERISTICS OF AFDC CLIENTS IN LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

By Gender...
* 3,279 of the 3,545 cases are female
* 266 of the 3,545 cases are male

By Educational Attainment...
* 1,895 of the 3,545 cases have less than a college education
* 1,618 of the 3,545 cases have a high school diploma and no further education
* 1,608 of the 3,545 cases have less than a high school diploma

By the Age of the Children of the AFDC Clients...
* 1,351 of the 3,545 cases have children under age six.
* 740 of the 3,545 cases have children under age three.

By Head of Household...
* 3,402 of the cases that are AFDC-R
* 143 of the cases that are AFDC-U

By Age of the Client Head of Household...
* 453 of the cases are between 16 - 19
* 1,510 of the cases are between 20 - 29
* 1,440 of the cases are between 30 - 44
* 142 of the cases are over 45

the CLC Public Assistance program provides education/training, case management, and academic/guidance counseling. The LCHD-VS facilitates job readiness and career development workshops, provides case management and follow-up services, and makes employment referrals.

Successful completion of the program is measured by students either finding employment or continuing with their education. Approximately 300 clients are expected to be served during FY95 with an expected retention rate of 78%. The program, which runs on a fiscal year of July 1 through June 30, has been in

operation since 1975. The current JOBS training program began July 1, 1994 and will end June 30, 1995.

FUNDING

The total budget for the Public Assistance program is $117,950. This amount covers instructor and coordinator salaries, counseling and advisement, costs of tuition, books, and other materials. The entire amount is funded by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), which is indirectly provided through federal JOBS funding. The college supports the operation of the program within its adult education department by providing funding for direct operation and instruction. "In-kind services" are also provided by the community college and include classroom space, computer hardware and software, and administration services.

Funding for the LCHD-VS is provided through IDPAs Donated Funds Initiative which includes state contribution of 75 percent and local agency contribution of 25 percent. The Illinois Department of Public Aid Project Chance program is funded through federal JOBS funds.

BARRIERS

A key barrier inhibiting the development of the program was the lack of integration among agencies working with public aid clients resulting in duplication of services. Since 1975, the Public Assistance program has worked closely with IDPA to provide students with both education/training and support services. In 1991, College administrators saw the need for a more integrated approach. As a result, LCHD-VS joined this collaborative effort which enabled the Public Assistance Program and IDPA to provide more enhanced programming services. These three agencies met to discuss the needs of the clients and the strengths of each agency. The College of Lake County Public Assistance program was able to provide education/training and academic/guidance counseling. The IDPA-Project Chance was able to provide case management and support services. In addition, the LCHD-VS was able to facilitate the job readiness and career

development workshops and to provide follow-up services, job placement, and bring on board an employer advisory council. The emphasis of this collaborative effort is to prepare students for employment in the area of clerical skills training. The outcome of this tri-agency approach has resulted in shared staff responsibilities among the agencies, programming specifically designed to assist students in meeting the mandated 20 hour/week JOBS requirement and increased student completion rate. Since the inception of this collaborative approach, approximately 70 percent of the students graduating from the clerical skills training program have found employment.

Success of the program can also be attributed to linkage with business and industry. All three agencies work closely with an employer council comprised of local area businesses including Baxter, Abbott, Motorola, Kemper, First Midwest Bank, and NutraSweet. Individuals from these and other companies provide information on employment trends, and are also directly involved with the students by participating in classroom panel discussions, mock interview sessions, an employer shadowing project and Quality Training. The major outcome of this collaborative effort can be seen by the impact made on the success of the clients. Possibilities for program expansion into other employment areas include production and customer service.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

* The College of Lake County Public Assistance program has received recognition at the state level for clients who left the public aid rolls or who experienced a grant reduction due to participation in the program.

* Last October staff involved in the tri-agency collaboration were invited to present this model at the annual state-wide adult education conference.

* In 1993 the LCHD-VS received the NACo (National Association of Counties) award for participation in this collaboration effort.

JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE (IL)

CONTACT: DR. TERRY R. IRBY
CENTER FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AND LITERACY
214 NORTH OTTOWA
JOLIET, ILLINOIS 60431
(815) 727-6544 ext. 1212
FAX: (815) 727-1529

TITLE OF JOBS PROGRAM:

ADULT AND FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

PURPOSE

ADULT AND FAMILY SERVICES ASSISTS PUBLIC AID RECIPIENTS TO ACHIEVE ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY BY ENCOURAGING AND SUPPORTING THEIR ENROLLMENT AND RETENTION IN EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT WILL PREPARE THEM FOR EMPLOYMENT, ADVANCEMENT, AND/OR RETENTION IN THE WORKPLACE.

SERVICE AREA

In the Joliet community, the primary needs for adults, ages 16 and over, on public assistance, who lack the high school diploma and/or possess basic skills functioning at or below the 12th grade level, are basic skills education and vocational skills training and employment. Data provided by the Joliet Junior College (JJC) Area Planning Council indicates that over 13,310 adults in Will County lack a 9th grade education, and 334 high school students dropped out in Fiscal Year 1993. The number of individuals receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) from the Illinois Department of Public Aid has increased in recent years, numbering 3,164 for FY1993. Joliet Junior College chose to become involved in the JOBS Program because of its commitment to providing quality education and training for all adults who reside in Illinois Community College District 525, its state-assigned service area.

THE COLLEGE

Joliet Junior College is generally recognized as the first junior college (institutions that later evolved into community colleges) established in the United States. Located in Joliet Illinois, JJC was started with the assistance of William Rainey Harper, the President of the University of Chicago. The College's state-assigned service delivery area includes two counties, Will and Grundy. Will County is one of the six Illinois counties recognized by the Bureau of the Census of the U.S. Department of Commerce to be in the Standard Metropolitan Area of Chicago. Grundy County, which adjoins Will County to the west, is generally recognized to be of a rural character.

The College is committed to helping adults achieve self-sufficiency through the acquisition of academic and vocational skills. These skills will prepare them to obtain and retain employment and to leave the state's welfare rolls. The College's Adult and Family Support Services Program, the formal name of its JOBS Program, benefits participating students at the College in a number of ways. By far the most important benefit is the provision of resources for support and assistance accessing the educational and vocational services of the college. The connection to the College also serves as a focal point for delivering the many support services offered by agencies and organizations in the College's community.

THE PROGRAM

The Adult Family Support Services Program has addressed the needs of welfare recipients for educational, vocational, and general support services through cooperative programming and through the interagency referral of students. The targeted population includes: (1) Adults, 16 years of age and over, who receive AFDC and/or Social Security Income supplemental assistance; (2) Adults who lack the high school diploma or its equivalency (the GED); and (3) Adults who possess inadequate basic and job skills to obtain, retain, and advance employment.

The population is recruited from individuals throughout the College's state-assigned service area. They are all receiving public aid. This includes 21,009 individuals in Will County, a suburban county, and 1,583 individuals in Grundy County, an adjoining rural county. The Will and Grundy County offices of the Illinois Department of Public Aid verify the information and provide lists and mailing labels for potentially eligible participants. Of the potential 22,592 recipients in both counties, the total number of individuals served for FY1993 was 532.

Key characteristics of the 532 individuals served by JJC's Adult Family Support Services Program in FY1993 are as follows:

- 419 of the 532 were female (79 percent),
- they ranged from 16 to 33,
- 523, or 98 percent, needed developmental education.

Data for FY1993 indicates that approximately 105 of the 532 JOBS participants in JCC's Adult and Family Support Services Program, or about 20%, of the JOBS students enrolled in academic and vocational training curricula at the College. Another 418, or about 80 percent, are gainfully employed, and are not on state welfare rolls. In various forms, this program has operated for the past twenty years, however, with the passage of the Family Support Act of 1988, student flow into, and choices from the array of postsecondary programs offered by the College are much wider. The JCC Adult and Family Support Services Program begins July 1st and runs through June 30th of each year.

FUNDING

The total budget of JCC's JOBS program is $50,000 for supportive services and $58,810 for instruction. Eighty percent of the budget comes from federal sources and 20 percent from local funding sources.

The College provides valuable in-kind services including facilities, utilities, staff development, travel, and fringe benefits for staff. The College directly contributes to the program in all of the above areas. The dollar amount far exceeds the $108,000 support and instruction allocated through the state AFDC/JOBS funding agency, the Illinois Department of Public Aid.

BARRIERS

The key barriers to student participation are transportation and child care. In addition, there are problems bridging the program from the pre-college to college, academic, and vocational training levels. Communication and articulation problems appear to arise from an overall lack of understanding of the scope of a program designed to assist welfare recipients acquire education and training at the lowest pre-college levels through college and higher skill training levels.

Joliet Junior College is currently working closely with many agencies, including the Illinois Department of Employment Security, the Child Care Resource and Referral Agency, the Headstart Agency, the Joliet Housing Authority, the Will County Health Department, and the college's academic and vocational departments and units. Through collaboration and cooperation, resources are extended to many more students, and the level of available services is significantly expanded.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The program is consistently listed among the top ten programs in the state for the number of individuals it removes from the state welfare rolls.

VOICES FROM THE FIELD:

URBAN

COMMUNITY

COLLEGES

DUNDALK COMMUNITY COLLEGE (MD)

CONTACTS: KATHLEEN S. de WIT
COORDINATOR, NEW WORK FOR WOMEN
MICHAEL ZEKONIS
DIRECTOR, WORK-BASED EDUCATION
7200 SOLLERS POINT ROAD
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21222

TITLE OF PROGRAM:

NEW WORK FOR WOMEN

PURPOSE

THE NEW WORK FOR WOMEN PROGRAM PROVIDES COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES IN THE AREAS OF OUTREACH, COUNSELING, EDUCATION AND TRAINING, AND JOB PLACEMENT THAT ENABLE WOMEN TO MOVE INTO NONTRADITIONAL CAREERS, WITH A PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON APPRENTICESHIPS IN THE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES.

THE COLLEGE

In February of 1993, Dundalk Community College received one of six demonstration grants from the Women's Bureau in the U.S. Department of Labor to develop, implement, and institutionalize a model program for women in nontraditional careers. Working in partnership with the Baltimore County Office of Employment and Training, the Maryland Department of Economic and Employment Development, and the Baltimore Building and Construction Trades Training Council of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), the project has been extraordinarily successful in training and placing women in nontraditional careers.

THE PROGRAM

The NEW Work for Women Program provides comprehensive services to help women become competitive when applying for apprenticeship positions and on-the-job training programs, and facilitates their entry into the trades. Orientation workshops, assessments, career counseling, educational support and training, mentoring, and job placement assistance are offered. The primary educational component is the twelve-week Intensive Pre-apprenticeship Program, which is designed to provide the foundation skills necessary for success in building and construction trades careers. The Intensive Pre-apprenticeship Program includes courses in Blue Print Reading, Introduction to the Trades, Health and Safety, Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation and First Aid Certification, Industrial Measurements, Physical Conditioning, Workshop Mathematics, Basic Reading and Trades Vocabulary, Career and Life Skills, and a Support Group.

Of the 35 women who have participated in the demonstration grant project, 29 were employed. Of the 29 placements (20 was the goal for the demonstration grant), 26 were placed in jobs considered nontraditional for women, including plumber apprentice, carpenter apprentice, bridge carpenter, roller operator trainee, operating engineer apprentice, carpet and upholstery cleaner, truck driver, loan officer, metallurgy trainee, electrician's apprentice, brakeperson, and quality control technician.

The labor community has been actively involved in the program from the beginning, offering advice and guidance and serving on the project's advisory board. Apprenticeship directors from the local unions regularly speak to women in the project and sponsor field trips to their training facilities. This collaboration has resulted in the acceptance of ten women into union apprenticeships. Similarly, the State Highway Administration has also been an active participant, and six women have been placed with highway construction private contractors in on-the-job training programs.

Dundalk Community College is situated in an area of southeastern Baltimore County that is heavily industrialized. The college has extensive linkages with the

business community and to trade unions, as well as with the largely blue-collar population which surrounds it. Apprenticeship programs in the Baltimore area have been unable to recruit qualified women, and women have always been greatly under-represented in the trades. Dundalk Community College as an educational provider is ideally suited to implement a nontraditional training program, with facilities and staff to provide the technical expertise necessary for a comprehensive project.

The service area of the College is characterized by a significant number of low-income women. Many of the women are single mothers with limited education and skills, who have worked at low-paying, traditionally female jobs, often without benefits. The NEW Work for Women program is an opportunity for employment, which pays a family wage and offers a career ladder and benefits. Moreover, participation in a program on a college campus appears to enhance the self-esteem of the participants.

The NEW Work for Women project targets women in Baltimore County, Maryland who meet the eligibility guidelines of JTPA. This includes women who are unemployed, are displaced workers, or are economically disadvantaged, and it specifically includes Project Independence, Aid For Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients. To participate, students/clients must meet the following criteria:

- Be JTPA eligible under Title II or III,
- Be at least 18 years of age,
- Be a resident of Baltimore County, Maryland,
- Score a minimum of a 6th grade level on a reading and math assessment,
- Pass a physical screening.

Clients were recruited at Project Independence mass registrations and also through the local unemployment office's Job Service. New Work for Women is advertised in local newspapers and is represented at local jobs fairs. The NEW

Work for Women Program also involves many local agencies that deal with women's issues in its training program as speakers. Television and radio publicity pieces and frequent press releases have also been used.

Clients were selected after attending a one-day orientation workshop, a one-day assessment including the ABLE reading and math subtests, the Holland SDS and Myers-Briggs (MBTI), and a personal interview with the coordinator. The interview provided the opportunity to consider the assessment data with the client and to examine barriers, which must be faced for the client to succeed in training, and to evaluate the motivation of the client to be trained and to seek employment in a nontraditional field. An individualized program plan was then written for each client.

Of the 35 women enrolled in the Intensive Pre-apprenticeship Program, the average age was approximately 30 years old. Approximately one-fourth of the women were receiving unemployment, one fourth were non-Project Independence low-income clients, and one-half were Project Independence (AFDC/JOBS welfare-to-work) clients. Most of the women had a high school diploma or GED, and the six women who did not were enrolled in GED evening classes at the College. Many women needed remediation or tutoring in mathematics and were referred to the Learning Resources Center at the College for additional help.

The clients who found employment through the NEW Work for Women project have benefitted in significant ways from the program. This is because in most cases they have become employed in careers that offer an increasing wage, on-the-job training, and in the case of union apprenticeships, free schooling at night. Unions and businesses have benefitted from the NEW Work for Women Program because it has provided a pool of qualified, pre-screened female applicants and has enabled employers to move toward compliance with their affirmative action goals. The women from the program are prepared to meet the challenges of the nontraditional workplace, and employer feedback has indicated a higher retention rate for the program's graduates than had been experienced in the past.

FUNDING

The original award to Dundalk Community College from the Department of Labor Women's Bureau amounted to $119,000.00. Additionally, DCC contributed in-kind services in the form of administrative and support personnel, facilities, and equipment. The Maryland Department of Economic and Employment Development and the Local SDA also contributed resources in the form of personnel. NEW Work for Women estimated that it costs on average $3,500.00 to provide the services necessary to prepare women for nontraditional careers.

BARRIERS

Because the NEW Work for Women Project was a partnership between multiple agencies, care had to be taken to assure clear communication of expectations and needs of the partners. Administrative requirements of the JTPA system presented frequent challenges to the program design. More specifically, Dundalk Community College had to go to great lengths to help the JTPA delivery system understand that the program was not designed to turn all enrolling women into nontraditional employees, but instead to identify those women for whom such training would be appropriate and then to provide high quality services. The steps necessary for identification of qualified women were, at first, viewed as time consuming, confusing, and an example of "creaming" clients. Dundalk Community College takes the position that, with limited training funds available, it is our duty to target funds to the population most ready to benefit from the program design. It is important to note that current JTPA guidelines that require job placement within 90 days of program completion precluded the matriculation of completers into the regular DCC college curriculum. In the end, each of the partners came to respect the perspective and ability of the others. The fact that the project continues today, with the help of local funding, is evidence of a strong partnership between diverse entities.

While DCC is accessible by bus, transportation issues impact the women in training when career decisions are being made. Transportation often precludes

full participation of women in apprenticeship programs because of the frequent need to visit worksites in outlying areas and return to attend classes in the evening at the apprenticeship training facility. Many program participants, if they do own cars, possess older, unreliable vehicles. In the trades it is a challenge to find placement opportunities which are accessible via public transportation.

Child care continues to be a major barrier to the training and placement of women. While AFDC recipients receive help paying their day care providers during training and, for a time, on the job, the number of licensed day care providers does not meet the demand. When eligibility for day care assistance ends, women are faced with the hardship of meeting the high cost of quality day care on an entry level income. Women often do not have family support when children are ill and cannot attend day care centers. Absence of child care is a primary reason participants miss training.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The NEW Work for Women project has received local, state, and national recognition. In the first year, three proposals written by the project coordinator were accepted for presentations at two national conferences and at a state conference. The coordinator has received numerous requests to speak at local and regional conferences and meetings. The conferences include the tri-state region apprenticeship director's meeting at the George Meany Center for Labor Studies, the Region III Women Work! Conference, the Maryland's Tomorrow Summer Institute, and the American Association of University Women, Baltimore Chapter. A presentation given at a national conference is under consideration for inclusion in the U.S. Department of Education's Educational Research and Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) system.

The program has been spotlighted on local and state television and radio on five occasions, as well as in the printed media, including the Baltimore Business Journal and the Baltimore Sun newspapers, as well as the Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council's newsletter.

FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE (FL)

CONTACT: Mr. Luther Quarles, DIRECTOR
PROJECT INDEPENDENCE
FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE
501 WEST STATE STREET
JACKSONVILLE, FL 32202
TELEPHONE: 904/632-3000
FAX: 904/632-3393

TITLE OF PROGRAM: PROJECT INDEPENDENCE

PURPOSE

THE MISSION OF PROJECT INDEPENDENCE IS TO PROVIDE ACCELERATED ADULT BASIC EDUCATION, GED, AND STUDENT SUCCESS COURSES THROUGH COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION, EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS INSTRUCTION, AND VALUE-ADDED SEMINARS TO ENHANCE EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS OF JOBS STUDENTS.

SERVICE AREA

Florida Community College at Jacksonville (FCCJ) serves a two-county service area in the northeast corner of Florida. Duval County, the major county in the service area, contains the metropolitan area of Jacksonville, Florida, one of the largest metropolitan areas in the southeast.

Duval County has 30,801 residents aged 25 years old and above who have less than an eighth grade education. An additional 67,261 residents have not completed high school, according to the 1990 U.S. Census. The past five years has seen the high school dropout rate range from 23 to 33 percent. Thus, nearly 100,000 persons, or about 23 percent of the adult population, plus those ages 16 to 24 who have not completed high school are in need of adult educational services. Unemployment for persons without high school diplomas is above 15 percent. More than 17 percent of the non-high school completers, including any children of these individuals, live in poverty.

THE COLLEGE

Florida Community College at Jacksonville is a four-campus community college that serves Duval and Jackson Counties. The College's commitment to serving JOBS clients stems from its institutional mission statement, and a strong desire starting with the Board of Trustees and the President of the College, Dr. Charles Spence, the faculty and administration to serve the needs of adult students in the community, and to make a difference in economic development. Providing adult literacy programs is considered part of the College's mission.

THE PROGRAM

The mission of Project Independence is to provide accelerated Adult Basic Education (ABE), high school equivalency test preparation (GED), and related student success programs to enhance the educational success of disadvantaged JOBS students. This is accomplished through computer-assisted instruction, employability skills instruction, and value-added seminars.

Each week, the Jacksonville Office of the Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security (DLES) refers Project Independence JOBS student participants from the Duval County area to FCCJ's Urban Resource Center. At the Urban Resource Center, students receive orientation and assessment. The DLES assures the provision of student attendance and follow-up, and funds for child care and transportation.

Assessment is conducted each week by a vocational evaluator using the Test of Adult basic Education (TABE). Students are placed into ABE, GED preparation, or post-secondary level courses in the regular FCCJ curriculum based upon their total assessment score. Further assessment is conducted to measure vocational career interests, temperament, and learning styles relevant to successful career choices. Twice during each semester students meet with the vocational evaluator individually for a discussion of assessment outcomes and career counseling.

Students attend ABE or GED classes on a daily basis at FCCJ's Geis Marine

Center, where they receive accelerated individualized instruction. Project Independence students receive instruction through state-of-the-art computer software that is geared to (1) track their progress and (2) meet the identified educational needs individualized to each participating student. The Project Independence (PI) advisor provides students with an orientation to the PI program, personal counseling as needed, and coordinates value-added seminars. The value-added seminars occur on a monthly basis. When combined with guest speakers, they provide students with current and helpful information on AIDS and Lifestyle Choices, Self-Motivation/Goal Setting, Breast Cancer Awareness, Non-traditional Careers, and other pertinent topics.

Completers of the Adult Basic Education program are referred to GED instruction or to DLES for job placement. Most students set goals that include completing their GED instruction, and to take and pass the GED examination. The ABE and GED components are geared for students to complete in one year or less. Grade level gains of between one and two grades per semester are typical for students in Project Independence.

Upon completion of the ABE and GED components, and after successfully passing the GED examination, college-bound students enter Project Independence's Urban Resource Center (URC). As part of their orientation, the URC staff administers the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) examination. Students who attain a level of 9.0 on the TABE are placed into the New Scholars Student Success class, while those below enter the Accelerated Learning class. The Accelerated Learning course rapidly increases their skills in reading, language usage, and mathematics required for entry into the credit and vocational certification programs at the College through intensive computer-assisted instruction in the basic skills. The New Scholars Student Success course provide 140 hours of instruction in college-going skills, career exploration, effective communication, time management, and college orientation to facilitate success in a postsecondary educational setting. Additionally, the New Scholars course offers computer assisted instruction to prepare them for the college credit entry test,

thereby helping the students side-step at least the first level of college preparatory courses, or to help those who place in the first level to progress to the next level after one term.

This instruction is important, in that the URC component is another entry into the Project Independence program for GED and high school graduates referred to FCCJ/PI by DLES. The URC also monitors and assists the students while they are in College by meeting with them regularly, on a one-on-one basis to discuss their progress and problems.

The Project Independence program is proud of the accomplishments of its JOBS students. As measured by enrollment, daily attendance rates, grade level gains, and GED completion rates steady upward progress has been made. In 1991-1992, JOBS students were not housed at the Geis Marine Center, and were not tracked as PI students. With the move to the Geis Center, student tracking of enrollments began: a total of 247 students were enrolled in 1992-1993, this number grew to 320 students in 1993-1994. In 1992-1993, 64 students attended 80 percent or more of the classes, in 1993-1994 52 students did so. By GED completion in 1991-1992 six students passed the GED; in 1992-1993, 23 of 29 students passed; while in 1993-1994, 45 of 46 PI students passed the GED examination. By grade level advancement, of the 43 students in the program in the 1993-1994 academic year, 14 advanced between 1 and 1.5 grade levels per term, 11 advanced from 1.5 to 2 grade levels per term, and 18 students advanced over 2 grade levels per term.

Four students from the 1992-1993 New Scholars Student Success component graduated with two-year Associates in Science degrees from FCCJ in 1993-1994. Out of the 105 students enrolled in the URC's Accelerated Learning course, 80 passed the GED during the year and were advanced to the New Scholars Student Success component. A total of 35 students by-passed the first level of college preparatory mathematics, and two tested directly into the initial College Algebra course. All but nine of the students by-passed the two College preparatory (or developmental) English composition courses. The TABE results from the program

have also been encouraging: some of the students have made remarkable gains ranging up to 5 grade levels in mathematics, 4 grade levels in reading, and 5 grade levels in language in a seven week period. The College attributes much of the success to the individualized, self-paced computerized instruction delivery mode, as well as the supportive environment developed for PI students.

BARRIERS

Achievement of the mission of this program relies upon the active partnership between FCCJ and the local office of the Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security. The College's provision of instruction squarely depends upon DLES' encouragement of participant attendance, especially by providing support for child care services and transportation to all students who need it.

The success of the Project Independence program also relies upon the following internal partnerships with key agencies and individuals: Adult and Vocational Assessment Department; Adult Students Instruction and program Development Department; Resource Development Department, Adult Studies Operations Department, Finance and Accounting Department, and the Administration of the Geis Marine Center. All of these internal departments are important to the success and continuous growth of this program.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The Project Independence program recognizes good attendance, grade level achievements, and GED completions at an annual Recognition Ceremony and Picnic. At this event, students and staff bring covered dishes and, along with their families and FCCJ college administrators and faculty, recognize the accomplishments of PI students.

LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST COLLEGE (CA)

CONTACT: PHYLLIS K. NORWOOD
GAIN DIRECTOR
LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST COLLEGE
1600 W. IMPERIAL HIGHWAY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90047
(213) 241-5477
FAX: (213) 241-5380

TITLE OF PROGRAM:
GREATER AVENUES OF INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM (GAIN)

PURPOSE

THE LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST COLLEGE GAIN PROGRAM PROVIDES EDUCATIONAL SERVICES THAT PREPARE RECIPIENTS OF AFDC FOR ENTRY LEVEL JOBS.

SERVICE AREA

Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC) serves South-Central area of Los Angeles. This area has been designated by the U.S. Department of Labor as economically and educationally disadvantaged, resulting from its low academic and work force skill levels. Through services offered through the Greater Avenues of Independence Program (GAIN), AFDC recipients can upgrade their skills to enable them to be better prepared to compete for the very limited entry level positions available. Students who receive permission from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services to enroll in a vocational program are undoubtedly reaping the greatest employment benefits upon completion.

THE PROGRAM

In 1986, the Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees voted unanimously that all nine of its campuses would participate in the statewide

GAIN program. In 1987 LASC was one of four colleges in the Los Angeles Community College system to implement a one year program.[14]

Instructional materials and services offered by GAIN are available for use by the regular students enrolled at the College. Since GAIN has excellent equipment and instructional programs, students are introduced to another dimension of educational services that supplement their traditional classes.

The LASC GAIN participants/students are placed in a controlled learning environment after diagnostic assessment. Multiple learning styles and teaching strategies are employed. For example, in the reading and writing classes learning styles and strategies are employed that integrate reading, writing, and cognitive development skills. Instructors use a combination of small group tutorial sessions, computer assisted instruction, individualized instruction, collaborative learning and traditional classroom instruction with teacher assistance. Internal studies have shown that reading levels for LASC/GAIN students *improved between eight-tenths of a grade level and five grade levels.* Writing competence has likewise shown improvement: Students are writing effective paragraphs and memos that are appropriate for entry level positions. Their reasoning and thinking skills improve as evidenced by their abilities to discern the differences between facts and fictions and between inferences and stated ideas.

In mathematics, two small controlled groups were studied. The most noted success was with the students who had been identified with learning disabilities. They were placed in an electronic class with heavy use of applied

---

[14]Editor's Note: The Family Support Act was signed into law by President Reagan in the fall of 1988. The GAIN program preceded the FSA. It is reasonable to assume that the greater flexibility FSA/JOBS provided the states, particularly in making postsecondary education an allowable activity, made implementing GAIN relatively easier at LASC. It is also important to note that Los Angeles Southwest College within the field of community colleges is well-known for its strong commitment to serving welfare-to-work students.

mathematics. The LASC/GAIN students improved their mathematical competence between two and seven grade levels.

Those LASC/GAIN students who placed into GED preparation are successfully passing the State-administered GED test. English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students are mainstreaming into college classes while others seek employment.

Many students work as county eligibility workers, real estate agents, data entry clerks, clerical assistants, library assistants, emergency hospital room clerks, child care workers, salespersons, and entrepreneurs. Some have decided to discontinue AFDC and are pursuing educational and career paths in nursing, teacher education, accounting, corrections, and child development.

Participants are referred to LASC/GAIN by the local office of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services. Over 90% of LASC/GAIN participants are females between the ages of 18 and 34 with limited educational experiences and without work force experiences. Therefore, LASC/GAIN must educate the total person holistically.

Participants have benefitted from the LASC/GAIN program. Many GAIN participants have never before dealt with a college, and need assistance in learning how to access the many programs and services of a large urban community college campus. The LASC/GAIN program is designed to promote the direct access of these students to opportunities that allow them to matriculate into regular college courses.

FUNDING

The LASC/GAIN program budget for 1994 is $420,000. All funds come from GAIN and JTPA. In-kind services are donated space and facilities. The College has no financial commitment to GAIN.

BARRIERS

If the educational providers of GAIN were free to assess and design individualized programs that meet underdeveloped market needs and provide the educational preparation to students, there would be much greater success of participants entering the workforce and getting off welfare permanently. This is the path to reducing the welfare rolls.

Students are also not always permitted to remain in the program until they have acquired sufficient skills to actively compete in the current job market. Additionally, vocational education is not encouraged. LASC has tried unsuccessfully to offer concurrent education -- vocational education and basic skills. The California Department of Public Social Services will not permit it.[15] Students are always mainstreamed into the college courses as quickly as possible upon entering LASC.

---

[15]Editor's Note: The California State Department of Public Social Services has emphasized instead short-term training to promote more immediate placement into jobs. This practice runs counter to what the research literature says is needed for the jobs of the future.

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, NORTH CAMPUS (FL)

CONTACT: TOM HALLORAN
MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE NORTH CAMPUS
11380 N.W. 27 AVE
MIAMI, FL 33167
(305) 237-1668

TITLE OF PROGRAM: PROJECT INDEPENDENCE

PURPOSE

TO PROVIDE ENHANCED TESTING, ADVISEMENT AND COUNSELING TO AFDC RECIPIENTS WHO ARE ENROLLED IN LONGER TERM TRAINING PROGRAMS AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE. "PROJECT INDEPENDENCE" WAS ESTABLISHED IN FLORIDA TO IMPROVE RETENTION IN TRAINING, JOB PLACEMENT AND JOB RETENTION RATES FOR THIS POPULATION.

SERVICE AREA

The AFDC population in Florida has grown much faster than experts had predicted and is perceived as placing a strain on State budget resources. The last two governors have addressed this situation by creating and supporting Project Independence, a two year training program to prepare AFDC recipients for career-track employment and household independence from welfare.

THE PROGRAM

The North Campus of Miami-Dade Community College, one of the largest single campus urban-based community college east of the Mississippi River, has received hundreds of trainees from the local Private Industry Council/Training and Employment Consortium agencies that refer Project Independence participants to vocational training programs at the College. The success rate of such trainees was not what it should have been because of placement of some

participants in programs that were too difficult for them, and a lack of understanding by the referring agencies of the College's student services system.

To address this problem, the College requested and received enhancement funds to address the needs of the trainees and of the PIC counselors who required support to properly advise and motivate their participants. This helped the North Campus acquire the hardware and software to provide the necessary training to the counselors and improve the success rate of the trainees. The following data speak to the positive results of this effort at improved program collaboration:

(1) More than 300 participating Project Independence trainees have been referred to the North Campus each year for longer term training after eligibility testing by the PIC agencies that voucher them into these training programs.

(2) These students, over the past three years, have needed basic skills remediation up to a minimum of 9th grade workforce literacy. They were all economically and educationally deficient by definition. They were referred to the College by 15 different community-based PIC funded organizations.

(3) The students have either completed or are continuing to study vocational certificate or Associate of Science degree programs -- with markedly higher retention rates. The program operated for the past three years, but has not been continued for the upcoming academic year.

All the trainees have entered regular College courses and programs, and there was no segregation into separate training programs. There was an excellent job placement and retention rate for those who finished. Approximately 100 trainees have completed the program and been placed. Only about 15 percent dropped out. The rest are continuing training.

Unfortunately, the program was discontinued due to changing State requirements for reimbursement of program costs. The procedures for student

processing and coordination with PIC/TEC agencies require the recipients be placed directly into the regular Vocational Programs Department on the North Campus.

FUNDING

The budget was $200,000 per year of Federal funds distributed through the regional State of Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (HRS) agency. A 40 percent match from in-kind services worth $80,000 was provided by the College each year. These in-kind services included part of the time of five staff and administrative persons in the Business/Technology Division as well as the resources of the Vocational Support Microcomputer Lab for testing, advisement and remedial education skill building. In addition, the Student Services area contributed part of the time and effort of four other staff and administrative persons, as well as office space for the six project staff.

BARRIERS

Since PIC/TEC referred all trainees, the participants had tuition and books as well as transportation and child care provided by that agency. The barrier of understanding of the College by the PIC/TEC agency counselors was overcome by providing office space to these counselors in the faculty area of the Business/Technology Division. Also, the student progress and advisement (AGIS) reports were generated by report requests on the College mainframe the week after the 100 percent tuition reimbursement deadline passed each semester, and the week before walk-in registrations were allowed. Agency counselors have become quite knowledgeable and sophisticated in advisement, due to the close working relationship that has developed between them and Division faculty. Interagency coordination with State of Florida HRS was never accomplished to the satisfaction of the College.

The barrier of persistence that longer term training presents to an AFDC

dependent population was overcome by frequent motivational workshops and counseling on personal issues by project staff.

The barrier of academic success was overcome by close selection of students vouchered into longer term training, as well as ongoing vocational interest and aptitude advisement for students who were failing key courses. Many such students became successful in alternate programs that were not so difficult or were more appropriate for them.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The Project Independence Enhancement grant did not receive any special awards. However, the Vocational Support Microcomputer Support Lab that provided the software and hardware assistance for students to be tested and advised did receive the Exemplary Practices award from the State of Florida Department of Education and a Best Practices award from the Florida Association of Community Colleges.

There continue to be referrals of AFDC Project Independence students to the community college. The targeted population is an important component of the mission of the Vocational Programs Department at the North Campus of Miami-Dade Community College.

MT. HOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE (OR)

CONTACT: NAN POPPE
MT. HOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
STEPS TO SUCCESS
14030 NE SACRAMENTO
PORTLAND, OREGON 97230
(503) 256-0432
FAX (503) 256-5503

TITLE OF PROGRAM: STEPS TO SUCCESS

PURPOSE

STEPS TO SUCCESS IS A PARTNERSHIP OF A BROAD RANGE OF EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, HEALTH, AND SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS WHO WORK TOGETHER TO ASSIST WELFARE RECIPIENTS TO ACCESS THE SERVICES NECESSARY TO BECOME ECONOMICALLY SELF-SUFFICIENT.

THE SERVICE AREA

Washington and Multnomah counties, which comprise Service District 2, have a population of 963,500. This is 31.5 percent of all Oregonians, with the highest density, 605,000, living in Multnomah County. Portland, Oregon's largest city, is the hub of the district. According to 1990 Census data, 95,083 people in Service District 2 fall below poverty level. Of those in poverty, 61 percent are women and 30 percent are African-Americans. Thirteen percent of the children in the metropolitan area ages 0 to 17 years live in poverty in single-parent households. Sixty percent of the economically disadvantaged are *in* the workforce -- they are the "working poor."

According to the Regional Workforce Quality Committee, the district's economy is broad-based, including manufacturing (durable and non-durable

goods), mining, construction, transportation, communications, utilities, trade, retail trade, finance, services, government, and education enterprises. The fastest growing sectors are services and trade. Of all the new jobs projected for Oregon by the Year 2000, 92 percent are projected to be in the service sector. The majority of the new jobs will be in medium and small firms. Eighty-five percent of all the work will be done by those already employed. (State of Oregon Employment Division, August, 1992)

Unemployment ranges from 6.2 to 6.6 percent. However, within the varying groups of the labor force, there are very different unemployment figures. The unemployment rates also differ according to geography within the district. For example, Washington County has the lowest rate, with Multnomah County running higher. In Northeast Portland, part of Multnomah County, unemployment runs double to triple the rate for the metropolitan area, 12 to 18 percent. Much of this area is considered "inner city," with a high concentration of minority populations.

Long term unemployment is most prevalent among African-American males in Multnomah County. All minority populations have higher unemployment, lower high school completion rates, and higher incidences of poverty. Minorities are at high risk of being chronically underemployed or unemployed. National studies show a significant gap between the skill the work force has and the needs of employers to meet the demands of an increasingly sophisticated work environment. Employers are consistently concerned about the low quality of the skills of many new employees. These skill deficits are most evident at the entry level.

THE COLLEGE

Mt. Hood Community College (MHCC) has a long history of providing employment and training services, alternative education, and other community services. An important part of the MHCC vision is to provide education and economic opportunities for disadvantaged populations. Through its role as the

JOBS Prime Contractor for Service District 2, MHCC supports and promotes innovative programs in partnership with the Oregon Department of Adult and Family Services, which assists welfare recipients and others in poverty to become economically self-sufficient.

THE PROGRAM

The MHCC JOBS Program is called *Steps to Success* (STS). The STS Program is in its sixth year of operation providing education and employment services to more than 3,000 welfare recipients annually. A customized Employment Development Plan is written for each STS client. There are a variety of service options, which are mixed and matched, to meet the needs of the client. The selected mix of services is determined through a comprehensive assessment process. The major services provided by STS include:

- skill, work history, strengths and barriers assessment,
- career and life planing,
- lifeskills instruction,
- basic education and GED preparation and testing,
- vocational training,
- volunteer work experience,
- job search and placement assistance,
- on-the-job training,
- mental health counseling,
- substance abuse counseling,
- parent education,
- case management,
- information and referral,
- and teen parent services.

Steps to Success collaborates closely with a diverse group of public and private sector organizations. The purpose of this partnership model is to promote an integrated service delivery model, which maximizes resources for the poor and minimizes duplication of effort. Some of STS's partners include the Private Industry Council that oversees JTPA programs, local school districts, community action agencies and programs, mental health service

providers, substance abuse programs, the Oregon Employment Division, Portland Community College, and Adult Family Services. One of the most critical partners in STS' effort to assist welfare recipients to get jobs is the *employer network.* Steps to Success has placed employees with over 200 large companies, small firms, and public agencies throughout the Portland Metropolitan Area.

In the Portland Metropolitan Area, JOBS programs have had a substantial and positive impact on the ability of welfare recipients to obtain and retain employment. This success has come from a history with welfare-to-work programs involving a partnership approach, which started in 1987 with the planning for a New Jobs Pilot in the East Portland area. Since 1990, the entire area has been involved in the delivery of services under the current JOBS plan..

On an annual basis, over 5,000 clients are enrolled in Steps to Success, and over 2,900 clients are placed into full-time unsubsidized employment. A demographic breakdown of these clients appears in Table One, "Characteristics of Clients Served by Steps to Success," below.

TABLE ONE
CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIENTS SERVED BY STEPS TO SUCCESS

Age	Percent
14-19	8%
20-24	25%
25-35	43%
35-44	20%
45+	4%

Sex	Percent
Male	14%
Female	86%

Ethnic Background	Percent
Asian-American	2%
African-American	6%
Hispanic-American	4%
Native American	2%
Caucasian	86%

Family Size	Percent
Two Members	19%
Three Members	29%
Four Members	24%
Five Members	14%
Six or more	14%

Educational Level	Percent
Below grade 12	42%
High school graduate	48%
Post high school	10%

BARRIERS

Steps to Success clients experience some of the traditional barriers associated with welfare recipients. These include, but are not limited to transportation, child care, unstable living conditions, abusive relationships, illiteracy, lack of work experience, and lack of training. Historical data reveals the range of barriers in Table Two, "Barriers Affecting Steps to Success Clients."

TABLE TWO
BARRIERS AFFECTING STEPS TO SUCCESS CLIENTS

Barrier Identified	*Percent of Clients Affected*
Physical abuse victim	54%
Alcohol/drug abuse	40%
Alcoholic/addict spouse or partner	73%
Low parenting skills	60%
History of legal problems	38%

FUNDING

Steps to Success has an operating budget of about $5 million each year. Approximately 90 percent of the budget is from federal JOBS and discretionary dollars, and 10 percent is funded from the State of Oregon general funds.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The major awards, which Steps to Success has received include: (1) "Program of the Year" for 1989 awarded by American Association of Community College Women; and (2) the Literacy Partnership Award for 1992 awarded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CONTACT: TERRI GREENFIELD
DIRECTOR, STEPS TO SUCCESS/NORTH
PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
4317 NE EMERSON
PORTLAND, OREGON 97217
(503) 281-0495 ext. 266

PROGRAM TITLE: STEPS TO SUCCESS/NORTH

PURPOSE

STEPS TO SUCCESS/NORTH EMPOWERS INDIVIDUALS TO ENTER THE WORKFORCE TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES AND THEIR FAMILIES, TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE, AND TO BECOME A VIABLE FORCE IN THE COMMUNITY.

SERVICE AREA

Steps to Success/North (STS/N) provides services to JOBS participants in an urban community college setting. Located in the heart of inner-city Portland, Steps to Success/North deals with long term welfare recipients who are often multi-generational poverty and oppression victims. The STS/N program addresses needs including life skills classes, career focus classes, adult basic education and GED preparation, vocational training, work experience, job development, job retention, and job placement activities.

THE PROGRAM

The targeted population is Aid For Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients. In Oregon, participation is mandatory for recipients with children over one year of age. The students are selected after initial assessment testing, work history evaluation, assessment by their case manager, and a random sort for a national study presently being conducted by the Manpower Development Resource Corporation. This comprehensive initial intake assessment is

performed to provide a wider utilization of related services so that available JOBS dollars can be extended to offer quality integrated services to welfare recipients.

Anecdotal evidence suggests the average age of Steps to Success/North (STS/N) students at Portland Community College (PCC) is slightly younger than many programs in the state. The gender of the students is approximately 90% female and 10% male. The socio-economic status of most of the students is below the poverty level. The majority of students do not possess a high school diploma or GED. Consequently, the need for developmental education is great because literacy and math levels are low. Officials at PCC believe many students have previously undiagnosed learning disabilities and are currently piloting a joint project with the College and the Oregon Department of Vocational Rehabilitation to evaluate and assist with appropriate services for these students.

Approximately 1,000 students per year participate in STS/N. The STS/N Program has been in operation since 1990. The STS/N Program is funded on a biennial basis, with current funding officially expiring June 30, 1995. However, officials at PCC officials expect renewal of funding for STS/N to be at similar levels for next biennium, because of STSN's demonstrated success.

Few JOBS trainees go on to enter the regular collegiate curriculum through transfer or matriculation into academic and degree programs at PCC. However, about twenty percent of STS/N students participate in vocational training at the College. Three-quarters of these students receive basic educational and GED services. Job Placements exceeded 1,200 per year.

FUNDING

Total budget for this site is $1.3 million, annually. Most money comes from State of Oregon JOBS funding, which is federally matched. Portland Community College provides two additional Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) staff members to assist with job development and student transition to college. The

staff are funded with PCC's Carl Perkins dollars. In-kind services include central College services, such as personnel, student records, and space on campus. Portland Community College also provides specialized services for the students who enroll at the College's campuses. The only direct cost to the College is the two FTE staff members, approximately $70,000.

BARRIERS

Barriers for success for STS/N students include safe transportation and child care, because of the high level of gang activity in the local neighborhood. Many STS/N students have significant problems related to mental health and drug and alcohol issues, as well as safety issues from the trauma of life in the inner city. Portland Community College has assisted with funds for child care. In addition, PCC provides social service funding for students who enroll in classes at the College. The College also operates an on-site Headstart Program which students can access.

As in all partnerships there have been challenges, but direction of the project is shared by College and Oregon JOBS social service staff. Staff from both entities are located together, as well as staff from the Private Industry Council, Employment Department, County Mental Health and Drug and Alcohol agencies. Confidentiality continues to be an issue which the partners struggle with all the time.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

- Steps to Success/North received a literacy program excellence award from NACC for the success of its GED and ABE Programs.
- PCC and STS/N have been visited by many federal and Region X agents, including Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary,

Administration for Children and Family, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, as part of an examination of model JOBS programs.

- The co-directors testified last year at Progressive Policy Institute meeting in Washington, D.C.
- PCC was visited by the Philadelphia Enquirer, which featured PCC in a recent story.
- The program has been nominated recently for a Diversity Award from the Metropolitan Human Rights Coalition in Portland.
- The site has been number one in job placement for State JOBS Programs several times.
- A recent STS/N program graduate after completing STS/N and obtaining employment, came back to the College and finished her degree. This student was subsequently selected as speaker at a recent College-wide graduation.

Anecdotal information of success abounds. Recently a student who has been employed for a year returned to the STS/N Program because she now works in a management capacity. She hired a current STS/N student to work for her. Steps to Success/North also acts as a temporary service for the College, and many students have been successfully employed. Graduates have gained employment ranging from entry level jobs, to those who own their own businesses.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community Colleges. (1993). Community colleges: A national profile. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Community Colleges. (1993). The workforce training imperative: Meeting the training needs of the nation. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1990). Productive America: Two-year colleges unite to improve productivity in the nation's workforce (ED 317 224). Washington, DC: Author.

Bailis, L. (1991). Challenges and opportunities for coordination [Panel Presentation]. Proceedings of "Making the Connection: Coordinating Education and Training for a Skilled Workforce" (pp. 17-19). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Blank, S. (1992, Summer). JOBS as a two-generation intervention. Public Welfare, 50(3), 46-51.

Bliss, T.J. (1994). The involvement of America's community colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training program: A national study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Burtless, G. (1992, May). Public spending on the poor: Historical trends and economic limits. Paper presented at the conference on Poverty and Public Policy, Madison, Wisconsin.

Caputo, R.K. (1989). Limits of welfare reform. Social Casework, 70, 85-95.

Carnevale, A.P. (1991). America and the New Economy. American Society for Training and Development. Washington, D.C. [while this study was funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, it does not reflect official views of the department].

Chilman, C.S. (1992, September). Welfare reform or revision? The Family Support Act of 1988. Social Service Review, 349-373.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1989). The American community college (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cranston, A. (1990). Work and family: Public policy issues for the 1990s. Families in Society, 71, 360-365.

Dickinson, N.S. (1986). Which welfare work strategies work? Social Work, 31, 266-272.

Downey, T.J. (1991). Selected issues relating to the AFDC and the JOBS programs. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 1-257.

Dumas, K. (1992, April). States bypassing Congress in reforming welfare. Congressional Quarterly, 950-953.

Ellwood, D. T. (1986, January). Targeting "would-be" long-term recipients of AFDC. Princeton: Mathematica Policy Research, Incorporated.

Federal Register, 54(73), 15638-15695.

Gittell, M., & Moore, J. (1989). Denying independence: Barriers to the education of women on AFDC. In S.L. Harlan & R.J. Steinberg (Eds.), Job training for women: The promise and limits of public policies. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gueron, J. (1990). Work and welfare: Lessons on employment programs. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 4, 79-98.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education: Kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Howard, M.A. (1991, April). Fiscal survey of the states. Washington, DC: National Governor's Association and National Association of State Budget Officers.

Hudson Institute. (1988). Opportunity 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Johnson, A.S. (1992, Spring). The states remain committed to JOBS. Public Welfare, 50(2), 20-21.

Johnston, W.B., & Packer, A.H. (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century. Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.

Katsinas, S.G. (1993). Community colleges and workforce development in the new economy in Communnity Services Catalyst, Winter, 1993.

Katsinas, S.G., and Lacey, V.A. (1989). Economic Development and Community Colleges: Models of Institutional Effectiveness. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Katsinas, S.G., & Swender, H.J. (1992, June/July). Community colleges and JTPA: Involvement and opportunity. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 62(6), pp. 19-23.

Levy, F. (1979, Winter). The labor supply of female heads, or AFDC work incentives don't work too well. Journal of Human Resources, 14, 76-97.

Lively, K. (1992, August 12). Governors' panel urges 2-year colleges to strengthen job-training programs. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A21.

Magruder, D.R. (1988). Community college and business partnerships: A statewide model skills program. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, 10(3), 239-249.

National Governor's Association. (1993, August). The new welfare reform. National Governor's Association.

NETWORK. (1990, November). America's two-year college employment, training, and literacy consortium. Results of the 1989-1990 NETWORK survey of two-year college involvement in employment, training, and literacy. Cleveland: Author.

O'Neill, J. (1993, Summer). Can work and training programs reform welfare? Journal of Labor Research, 14(3), 265-281.

Peskin, J., Topogna, J., & Marcotte, D. (1992, October). How the economy affects AFDC caseloads. Paper presented at the annual meetings of APPAM, Denver, CO.

Public Law 100-485. The Family Support Act of 1988.

Riccio, J., & Friedlander, D. (1992, Summer). GAIN and the prospect of JOBS's success. Public Welfare, 50(3), 22-32.

Rosen, D.P. (1986). Poverty, welfare and educational opportunity: Redeeming a national resource.

Sasaki, C. (1986, September). Off the dole, her career on a roll, Carol Sasaki leads Washington's welfare moms back to school. People, pp. 32-36.

Smith, B.E. (1991). Women of the Rural South: Economic Status and Prospects. Lexington: Southeast Women's Employment Coalition.

Stern, J.D. (Ed.). (1987). The condition of education. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education (1991, November). Digest of Education Statistics, 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Service. (1993, April). Administration for children and families: Welfare. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1989). Aid to families with dependent children; Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program; child care and supportive services; conforming changes to existing regulations. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1991, September). Welfare to work: States begin JOBS, but fiscal and other problems may impede their progress (GAO/HRD-91-106). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Waddell, G. (1990). Tips for training a world-class work force. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 60(4), 21-27.

Workforce 2000:Work and workers for the 21st century. (1987). Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.

Yglesias, K.D. (1987). Community Colleges and JTPA: Issues and Programs. Fountain Valley, CA: Coastline Community College.

APPENDIX ONE
List of Responding Community Colleges to the Survey Instrument

Number of Respondents N=277

Abraham Baldwin College	Georgia
Aiken Technical College	South Carolina
Alabama Aviation & Technical College	Alabama
Alamance Community College	North Carolina
Allegany Community College	Maryland
Alpena Community College	Michigan
Alvin Community College	Texas
Amarillo College	Texas
Andrew College	Georgia
Anson Community College	North Carolina
Aquinas College at Newton	Massachusetts
Arapahoe Community College	Colorado
Arizona Western College	Arizona
Austin Community College	Minnesota
Bainbridge College	Georgia
Barstow College	California
Barton County Community College	Kansas
Beaufort County Community College	North Carolina
Bevell State Community College	Alabama
Big Bend Community College	Washington
Bishop State Community College	Alabama
Blackhawk Technical College	Wisconsin
Blinn College	Texas
Bluefield State College	West Virginia
Blue Mountain Community College	Oregon
Blue Ridge Community College	Virginia
Brazosport College	Texas
Brevard Community College	Florida
Brookdale Community College	New Jersey
Broome Community College	New York
Bristol Community College	Massachusetts
Brunswick College	Georgia
Bucks County Community College	Pennsylvania
Burlington County College	New Jersey
Butler County Community College	Kansas
Camden County College	New Jersey
Cape Fear Community College	North Carolina
Carl Albert State College	Oklahoma

Carl Sandburg College	Illinois
Carteret Community College	North Carolina
Casper College	Wyoming
Cayuga Community College	New York
Cecil Community College	Maryland
Cedar Valley College	Texas
Central Carolina Technical College	South Carolina
Central Community College	Nebraska
Central Florida Community College	Florida
Central Ohio Technical College	Ohio
Central Piedmont Community College	North Carolina
Central Virginia Community College	Virginia
Central Wyoming College	Wyoming
Cerritos College	California
Chattanooga State Technical Community College	Tennessee
Chemeketa Community College	Oregon
Clackamas Community College	Oregon
Clark College	Washington
Clark State Community College	Ohio
Clatsop Community College	Oregon
Clinton Community College	Iowa
Coastal Carolina Community College	North Carolina
Coffeyville Community College	Kansas
College of DuPage	Illinois
College of Lake County	Illinois
College of The Albemarle	North Carolina
College of the Canyons	California
College of the Desert	California
Columbia Basin College	Washington
Columbia-Greene Community College	New York
Community College of Allegheny County	Pennsylvania
Community College of Denver	Colorado
Community College of Rhode Island	Rhode Island
Community College of Spokane	Washington
Copiah-Lincoln Community College	Mississippi
Corning Community College	New York
Cottey College	Missouri
Cowley County Community College	Kansas
Cuesta College	California
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College	Virginia
Dakota County Technical College	Minnesota
Dallas County Community College District	Texas
Danville Community College	Virginia
Darton College	Georgia

Dawson Community College	Montana
DeKalb College	Georgia
DeKalb Technical Institute	Georgia
Dixie College	Utah
Dyersburg State Community College	Tennessee
East Arkansas Community College	Arkansas
East Georgia College	Georgia
Eastern Iowa Community College District	Iowa
Eastern Shore Community College	Virginia
Eastern Wyoming College	Wyoming
Eastfield College	Texas
Edison Community College	Ohio
Elgin Community College	Illinois
Erie Community College	New York
Everett Community College	Washington
Fairmont Community College	West Virginia
Fashion Institute of Technology	New York
Faulkner State Community College	Alabama
Fayetteville Technical Community College	Arkansas
Fergus Falls Community College	Minnesota
Florida Community College at Jacksonville	Florida
Fort Berthold Community College	North Dakota
Fort Scott Community College	Kansas
Frontier Community College	Illinois
Fulton-Montgomery Community College	New York
Galveston College	Texas
Garrett Community College	Maryland
Gateway Technical College	Wisconsin
Germanna Community College	Virginia
Greenfield Community College	Massachusetts
Greenville Technical College	South Carolina
Harford Community College	Maryland
Harrisburg Area Community College	Pennsylvania
Hawkeye Community College	Iowa
Haywood Community College	North Carolina
Henderson Community College	Kentucky
Henry Ford Community College	Michigan
Highland Park Community College	Michigan
Hinds Community College	Mississippi
Hocking Technical College	Ohio
Holmes Community College	Mississippi
Houston Community College System	Texas
Howard Community College	Maryland
Hudson County Community College	New Jersey

Illinois Central College	Illinois
Indiana Vocational Technical College	Indiana
Iowa Valley Community College District	Iowa
Itawamba Community College	Mississippi
Ivy Tech State College	Indiana
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	Virginia
Jefferson College	Missouri
Jefferson Community College	Kentucky
Jefferson State Community College	Alabama
Jefferson Technical College	Ohio
John A. Logan College	Illinois
John M. Patterson State Technical College	Alabama
Johnson County Community College	Kansas
Kankakee Community College	Illinois
Kaskaskia College	Illinois
Kennebec Valley Technical College	Maine
Kirtland Community College	Michigan
Kishwaukee College	Illinois
La Guardia Community College	New York
Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College	Wisconsin
Lamar Community College	Colorado
Lane Community College	Oregon
Laredo Community College	Texas
Leeward Community College	Hawaii
Lenoir Community College	North Carolina
Lewis & Clark Community College	Illinois
Lincoln Trail College	Illinois
Luzerne County Community College	Pennsylvania
Manatee Community College	Florida
Marshall University Community College	West Virginia
Maui Community College	Hawaii
Miami-Dade Community College - North	Florida
Mid-Michigan Community College	Michigan
Mid-Plains Community College	Nebraska
Middle Georgia College	Georgia
Middlesex County College	New Jersey
Midlands Technical College	South Carolina
Miles Community College	Montana
MiraCosta College	California
Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College	Mississippi
Mitchell Community College	North Carolina
Modesto Junior College	California
Mohave Community College	Arizona
Monroe College	New York

Monroe Community College	New York
Montgomery Community College	North Carolina
Moraine Park Technical College	Wisconsin
Motlow State Community College	Tennessee
Mount Hood Community College	Oregon
Mount San Antonio College	California
Mount San Jacinto College	California
Mount Wachusett Community College	Massachusetts
Muskegon Community College	Michigan
Nash Community College	North Carolina
Nassau Community College	New York
Naugatuck Valley Community College	Connecticut
Navarro College	Texas
Neosho County Community College	Kansas
North Central Missouri College	Missouri
North Central Technical College	Ohio
North Central Technical College	Wisconsin
North Central Texas College	Texas
Northeast Community College	Nebraska
Northeast Iowa Community College	Iowa
Northeast Mississippi Community College	Mississippi
Northeast State Technical Community College	Tennessee
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College	Wisconsin
Northeastern Junior College	Colorado
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College	Oklahoma
Northern Nevada Community College	Nevada
Northern New Mexico Community College	New Mexico
Northern Wyoming Community College	Wyoming
Northland Pioneer College	Arizona
Northwest Iowa Community College	Iowa
Northwest Shoals Community College	Alabama
Northwestern Connecticut Community College	Connecticut
Norwalk Community Technical College	Connecticut
Oakland Community College	Michigan
Oakton Community College	Illinois
Okaloosa-Walton Community College	Florida
Otero Junior College	Colorado
Palm Beach Community College	Florida
Palomar Community College	California
Panola College	Texas
Paris Junior College	Texas
Parkland College	Illinois
Pellissippi State Technical Community College	Tennessee
Penn Valley Community College	Missouri

Piedmont Virginia Community College	Virginia
Pima Community College	Arizona
Portland Community College	Oregon
Pratt Community College	Kansas
Prince William Sound Community College	Alaska
Prestonsburg Community College	Kentucky
Quinsigamond Community College	Massachusetts
Richland College	Texas
Richland Community College	Illinois
Rio Grande Community College	Ohio
Rio Salado Community College	Arizona
Riverside Community College	California
Roane State Community College	Tennessee
Robeson Community College	North Carolina
Rochester Community College	Minnesota
Rogue Community College	Oregon
Sampson Community College	North Carolina
Saint Charles County Community College	Missouri
San Jacinto College - South	Texas
San Juan College	New Mexico
Sandhills Community College	North Carolina
Scottsdale Community College	Arizona
Shasta College	California
Shorter College	Arkansas
Snead State Community College	Alabama
South Plains College	Texas
South Suburban College	Illinois
Southeastern Community College	North Carolina
Southside Virginia Community College	Virginia
Southwestern Oregon Community College	Oregon
Sparks State Technical College	Alabama
State Technical Institute at Memphis	Tennessee
Surry Community College	North Carolina
Texas State Technical College	Texas
Treasure Valley Community College	Oregon
Tulsa Junior College	Oklahoma
Tyler Junior College	Texas
Umpqua Community College	Oregon
Vernon Regional Junior College	Texas
Victoria College	Texas
Virginia Highlands Community College	Virginia
Wake Technical Community College	North Carolina
Walla-Walla Community College	Washington
Wallace Community College	Alabama

Warren County Community College	New Jersey
Washington State Community College	Ohio
Waubonsee Community College	Illinois
Waukesha County Technical College	Wisconsin
Weatherford College	Texas
Wenatchee Valley College	Washington
Western Iowa Tech Community College	Iowa
Western Piedmont Community College	North Carolina
Wharton County Junior College	Texas
Whatcom Community College	Washington
William Rainey Harper College	Illinois
Wilson Tech Community College	North Carolina
Windward Community College	Hawaii
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College	Wisconsin
Wytheville Community College	Virginia
Yavapai College	Arizona
York Technical College	South Carolina

APPENDIX TWO

AACC

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

February 25, 1994

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to ask for your participation in an important national study of community college participation in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program.

As you know, welfare reform along with crime and health care is one of the three most important issues to be addressed at the federal level this year. The Family Support Act of 1988, which created the JOBS program, marked a fundamental shift in welfare policy. This act was the result of a broad-based political consensus: That America's welfare system should foster long-term self-sufficiency by placing Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients directly into jobs or, alternatively, appropriate education and training. For the first time, AFDC recipients can use their JOBS benefits to obtain training at Postsecondary educational institutions, including community colleges.

The need for this research survey is readily apparent. We need good national data with which to inform the Congress about community college participation in welfare-to-work programs, to influence the welfare reform process. It is our view that the welfare-to-work, employment and training, and adult literacy systems all should be built around the nation's largest delivery system of formal education to adults, community colleges. Only in this way can we be assured that the system is structured to provide social mobility.

In as much as welfare reform is one of the top issues facing the Second Session of the 103rd Congress, federal officials are vitally concerned with good information for policy decision making. The enclosed questionnaire, "The Involvement of America's Community Colleges in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program: A National Study," was developed by Timm J. Bliss and Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas of the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education at Oklahoma State University. It assesses the participation of your community college in the JOBS program, and also serves as a vehicle to collect data on model JOBS programs at community colleges.

I heartily endorse this survey, and urge your cooperation and participation.

Sincerely,

Dave Pierce

David R. Pierce
President

JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND BASIC SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM (JOBS)

Survey of America's Community Colleges

Introduction

The purpose of this survey is to measure your attitudes and perceptions of the federally funded welfare program, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program (JOBS). For this national study, we are interested in learning the views of the community college regarding five specific topics:

(1) What is the level and extent of community college participation in the JOBS program?

(2) What identifiable model programs exist to provide postsecondary educational services to AFDC recipients? Are there identifiable models appropriate to specific types of community college settings (rural, suburban and urban/inner city)?

(3) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding community college involvement in JOBS policy development?

(4) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges of the barriers, both internal and external to the institution of effective community college delivery of JOBS services (including but not limited to the community college business office; state community/higher education rules and regulations, state audit and expenditure regulations; lack of understanding of the accounting of grant and performance-based contracts, and inclusion of such services in the community college mission statement).

(5) What are the perceptions of practitioners at community colleges regarding communication and collaboration between state agencies that oversee JOBS programs and community colleges?

Demographics

1. Name of Community College _____

2. Full-time Equivalency (FTE) _____

   Enrollment (include noncredit) _____

3. Name of person responsible for administering the JOBS program

Name _____ Title _____

Address _____ Phone _____

4. Is economic development an important mission of your community college?

____ Yes ____ No

If yes, does it include the following:

____ **Workforce Development for the Long-Term Unemployed**
(includes welfare recipients)
____ **Workforce Development for Those Never Employed Individuals**
(high school graduates and high school dropouts)
____ **Workforce Development for Temporarily Dislocated Workers**
(employment and training programs for short-term unemployed)
____ **Workforce Development to Improve the Skills of the Currently Employed**
(value added to maintain/advance workforce competitiveness)

5. Has your community college's JOBS program ever received an award from your state or local welfare agency and/or state or local government?

____ Yes ____ No

If Yes, describe

_____

_____

If you believe that your community college is operating a model program in any of the above mentioned areas, could you please send us information about your college's program(s) for inclusion in a publication tentatively titled, "Model Programs in Community College Workforce Development."

6. Does your community college currently operate programs under:

____ JOBS
____ JTPA
____ U.S. Department of Labor (direct)
____ Other Public Sector Programs
Describe _____

7. Please mark an X by those services currently offered by your community college:

___ GED Preparation
___ Adult Basic and Developmental/Remedial Education
___ Education for Individuals with Limited English Proficiency
___ Job-Skills Training
___ Job-Readiness Activities
___ Job Development/Placement
___ On-Campus Small Business Entrepreneurship/Incubation Center
___ Distance Learning to Deliver Literacy at the Worksite
___ Technology Transfer Programs
___ Alternative High School
___ Vocational/Occupational/Technical Curriculum
___ Supportive Services (child care, transportation)
___ Other, please describe

_____

8. Estimate the number of participants served through JOBS programs delivered at your community college in FY' 1993.

___ JOBS participants

9. Approximate total JOBS funds for FY'1993

___ less than $100,000
___ $100,000 to $249,999
___ $250,000 to $499,999
___ $500,000 and above

10. Approximate total amount of private sector contracts for FY'1993

___ less than $100,000
___ $100,000 to $249,999
___ $250,000 to $499,999
___ $500,000 and above

11. Is your community college interested in playing a more active role in federal welfare reform through programs like the JOBS program?

___ Yes
___ No

12. Is an employee of your community college a member of one or more of the following:

___ local PIC
___ state PIC
___ Area Economic Development Council
___ local JOBS Council
___ state JOBS Council
___ local Chamber of Commerce
___ state Chamber of Commerce
___ Area Council on Literacy

Please read each item carefully and place an X under the letter to indicate the response which most closely corresponds with your views.

Strongly Disagree (SD);
Disagree (D);
Undecided (U);
Agree (A);
Strongly Agree (SA)

Perceptions of Practitioners at Community Colleges Regarding Community College Involvement in JOBS Policy Development

		SD	D	U	A	SA
1.	*Current federal law promotes community college participation in JOBS*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	*The agency within my state that administers JOBS promotes community college participation in JOBS*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	*The JOBS agency within my state has hosted training sessions to promote community college participation in JOBS, so that AFDC recipients can more easily pursue postsecondary education*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	*The state community college or coordinating agency within my state promotes community college participation in JOBS programs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	*Community colleges are well represented on the local advisory boards that oversee JOBS programs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	*Community colleges are well represented on my statewide advisory boards that oversee JOBS programs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	*Sufficient **federal** funds are available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	*Sufficient **state** funds are available through JOBS to offer economic independence to AFDC recipients through postsecondary education*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	*Federal JOBS regulations provide sufficient flexibility for states and their community colleges to administer JOBS programs effectively*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	SD	D	U	A	SA
10. *There should be increased state/community college control over how federal JOBS funds are spent*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. *The criteria needed for measuring the effective return on investment of JOBS funds presently exist within my state's JOBS data collection system*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Barriers (internal and external) to Effective Community College Delivery of JOBS Programs

	SD	D	U	A	SA
12. *Federal need-based student aid is counted against welfare eligibility in my state (i.e., if the AFDC recipient applies for and receives a Pell Grant, their monthly allotment under AFDC is reduced by the amount awarded by Pell)*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. *To my knowledge, budget cuts in my state have precluded my state from matching all of the federal funds available for JOBS programs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. *There are insufficient funds within my state to guarantee child care for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. *There are insufficient funds within my state to pay necessary transportation and work-related expenses for all persons participating in the JOBS program at my community college*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. *The Health and Human Services' "20-hour rule" (20 required hours of participation in JOBS program activities per week) wastes scarce resources and is bias against postsecondary educational JOBS programs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. *The lack of common forms for in-take for both the JOBS and JTPA programs prevents full integration of these programs at my community college*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. *Adult literacy (which includes JOBS-sponsored adult basic education and GED training) is not specifically mentioned in the mission statement of my community college*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	SD	D	U	A	SA
19. *Adult literacy (which includes JOBS-sponsored adult basic education and GED training) is an activity that is a high priority at my community college*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. *The emphasis by the JOBS program in my state toward the most short-term education possible, with multiple of exit model to promote the goal of immediate job placement, is contrary to the kind of sequential educational programs that community college typically operate*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. *The state community college coordinating board or agency requires or encourages my community college to enroll JOBS participants in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom for regular college courses*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. *My community college has chosen to enroll JOBS participants in "no credit" programs, thereby denying the JOBS participants credit for time spent in the classroom*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. *The lack of understanding by administrators at my community college (including the business office) of the performance rules and accounting regulations of the JOBS program has resulted in a lower level of institutional participation by my college in JOBS*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. *My community college has simply chosen not to participate in the JOBS program*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Communication and Collaboration Between State Agencies and Community Colleges

	SD	D	U	A	SA
25. *My state agencies have shown little or no interest in organizing and implementing JOBS programs in my community college*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. *The map of the legally defined service areas for JOBS does not match the state-assigned service area of my community college*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. *The map of the legally defined service area for JTPA does not match the legally defined service area for JOBS and my community college's state-assigned area*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	SD	D	U	A	SA
28. *The existing fragmentation (maps not matching) has lessened the ability of my community college to coordinate and develop effective programs that link education to transitional welfare*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. *There exists a large amount of fragmentation (including lack of communication and "turf battles") between various state agencies that oversee welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) in my state*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. *Task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the community college meet on a regular basis to integrate their activities, so that AFDC recipients can be better served through the JOBS program*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. *It would be a good thing for program integration if task forces comprised of representatives of all the agencies dealing with JOBS, JTPA, and other literacy agencies, and the local community college met on a regular basis*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

You are very important to the success of this Study.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the JOBS program in your two-year college, or any comments in general? If so, please use this space and/or the back of this page for that purpose. Thank you for your assistance.